

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER, 1883.

---

ART. I.—THE THREE FAUSTS.

1. *Faust, eine Tragödie.* VON GOETHE. Stuttgart: 1867.
2. *El Mágico Prodigioso, Comedia.* Por D. PEDRO CALDERON DE LA BARCA. Nouvelle édit. Par J. G. MAGNABAL. Paris: 1875.
3. *Old English Drama: Marlowe's Tragical History of Dr. Faustus, &c.* By A. W. WARD, M.A. Oxford: 1878.

WHAT is the meaning, the aim, the destiny of this life which we are leading upon earth? Whence came our life? Whither is it going? "Is it worth the living?" This, says Mr. Mallock, is—

that painful mystery by which the heart of the modern world has been tortured, and before which the modern world is now standing with a fresh pang of amazement . . . . the question grows before us far more rapidly than the answer does. Farther and farther, certainly and more certainly are men pushing their conquests into regions that were once mysterious, and yet the mystery that has not been conquered remains more formidable than ever; or else if we would fain have nothing but mystery at all, a choice confronts us more momentous than was ever offered to the ancient world. Either man's life is a mystery to be solved by no scientific method, a mystery which no scientific method so much as sheds a glimmer of light on; either there is an order of things, which the proofs and verifications of the physicists cannot touch, or even go near to—things supernatural, supersensual and essentially immaterial, whose ways are not the ways of matter, nor the laws of matter its laws; and if this be so, in this region is to be sought by *faith*, a reconciliation of all the contradictions that torment us; — or else, if all this be untrue, then there are really in things no contradictions at all, except those of our own making. Man's moral and spiritual life is a dream. Justice is nothing but a name. It is not a power, and there is no reason why we should look for its supremacy. Men are

nothing but machines ;—forces of Nature by some means or other become self-conscious, but their lives are without any significance whatsoever . . . .

We are such stuff  
As dreams are made of, and our little life  
Is rounded with a sleep.

W. H. MALLOCK, *Lucretius*, pp. 170-172.

It would not be easy to find a better statement of the momentous problem which is agitating every intellectual mind at the present day—at least every intellectual mind outside the pale of the Faith—than in these memorable words of Mr. Mallock.

But it would be incorrect to suppose that this Sphinx's riddle is altogether a modern one. It may be true that it is agitating men's minds more seriously in our days than at any other time; and this just because, as Mr. Mallock puts it—

Now on all sides we see faith failing, philosophies in conflict, and science, though its superstructure is daily growing, feeling its foundations becoming more and more insecure. And amongst the most thoughtful minds who cannot accept faith as the guide of life, and who yet feel that reason alone will not take the place of it, we find traces theoretically, if not practically, of a despondent scepticism (*op. cit.* p. 172).

Quite true ; and the reason of it all is, that Protestantism is rapidly evanescent—that all religious (or indeed philosophical) dogma, or all that is religious resting on a dogmatical basis outside the Catholic Church—is dying away, leaving merely a species of religious activity based purely on emotion, which can never be permanent. But although men's attitude towards the problem may have changed, the great problem itself is ever the same. “What is life ? What is the origin,—the meaning,—the end, —the aim,—the philosophy of *this* life?” That is to say, not merely of life in the abstract, but of this particular life of man in our world, in this present given state of lapsed nature (as theologians would say). The problem is the fundamental problem of all philosophies, and must ever remain so.

But not only of philosophy, of poetry also, is this great riddle the ultimate subject-matter. And here we would say that, rightly considered, the divine discipline of poetry is not merely that to which it seems to have sunk in the present day—the art of merely producing pleasure by exquisite beauty of picturing, by dainty colouring, by subtle and refined music of rhythm and diction, as one of our most recent and melodious poets has it—

And these make up my sum of life's desire,  
To live for ever in the sun's broad fire,  
To know and love strong men and shapely girls,  
And nobly working till the end aspire.

And what end? Please notice his *summum bonum* :—

With colour, verse and harmony to frame  
*A house of beautiful delights*, whose name  
May stir the world with pleasure, like fine pearls  
Strung on a golden thread.

E. W. GOSSE, *On Viol and Flute*, p. 4.

Now, such an utterly sensual ideal as this, even for lyric poetry, is a calumny on the heavenly muse. Were this true, then we should have to confess that modern poetry, to speak at least of England, France, and Italy, like modern plastic art, had reached its acme of perfection.

But poetry, in its highest sense, is the Art of Philosophy. We mean this: Philosophy is that science which occupies itself with the great problem of man's life and end; and poetry is that art by which the poet,—the inspired one,—practically puts before the world, in a living manner, the true answer to the problem. The poet—the *vates*—at least the great world-poet, who is to be something more than a mere troubadour, “a singer on a summer's day,” is essentially an interpreter; and his task is to interpret for mankind at large the universal problem of life, the philosophy of the world. So it is well and beautifully put by one of the best of our English poetesses—

Quoth the hero dying, whelmed in glory :  
Many blame me, few have understood ;  
Ah, my folk, to you I leave a story—  
Make its meaning good.  
Quoth the folk : *Sing, poet! teach us, prove us,*  
*Surely we shall learn the meaning then.*  
Wound us with a pain divine ; oh, move us,  
For this *man of men*.—JEAN INGELOW, *Winstanley*.

The hero is the typical man, “the man of men,” whose life is a concrete teaching concerning the philosophy of life, and this concrete philosophy must be interpreted by the poet.

This view of poetry directly refutes a bold statement of that morbid lyrst, Mr. E. W. Gosse, from whose poems we have just quoted. After the lines cited he goes on to say—

There have been sage philosophers who found  
That pleasure was a dream, and song mere sound ;  
They passed, and left us poorer.—(*Loc. cit.*)

If, as we take it, this refers to those old philosopher-poets who thought that life was not destined merely for pleasure, nor poetry for mere jingle of sweet sounds, then is it doubly false. In the first place, they did not believe “song” in the sense of their divine art of poetry to be “mere sound;” but they *did* believe that the morbid, ultra-sensual singing of such writers

as Mr. Gosse, Mr. Marzials, Mr. Swinburne,—however dainty, however melodious (and all this it is more than we can say)—was “mere sound.” And they were right. The great world-poets, both those of the *ancient* pagan world, the mighty Greek dramatists, for instance, and above all, the poets of Christian times, and among those pre-eminent Dante, Calderon, Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, Goethe, were conscious of a higher and a greater calling; they felt the true inspiration of the seer; and can we say, that they have left us poorer? This being so, what answer did they give to the great problem put before them?

Mr. Mallock has already told us of the utter inability of reason and science to find any definite solution to the riddle. He has told us that Faith alone is capable of giving us the reconciliation of all the difficulties which meet us in it. There can be one, and only one, true solution; and that solution we must hold to be the Christian solution. This solution depends upon the revealed truths concerning the origin (creation) of man and his destiny, and the revealed historical account of that “order” or “state” of lapsed nature in which he now finds himself. Clear, distinct, definite, complete, coherent is this explanation. The Christian philosopher and poet, and we who share their faith and their doctrine, do not need to seek after truth,—we possess it, and rest in it calmly. Recall those wonderful lines of Lucretius, at the commencement of his second book:—

'Tis sweet, when tempests roar upon the sea,  
To watch from land another's deep distress  
Amongst the waves—his toil and misery.  
Not that his sorrow makes our happiness,  
But that some sweetness there must ever be,  
Watching what sorrows we do not possess . . . .  
But sweeter far to look with purged eyes  
Down from the battlements and topmost towers  
Of learning, those high bastions of the wise,  
And far below us see this world of ours,  
The vain crowds wandering, blindly led by lies.

LUCRETIUS, *De R. N.* ii. 699, Mallock's translation.

This well expresses the position of the Catholic intellect in regard to the surging theories and arguments that rage around him.

Of all the Christian poets named above, one stands pre-eminently forth in the universality, the completeness, the clearness, the certainty of his solution of life's problem. For this reason Archbishop Vaughan says that Dante stands alone among the poets, as St. Thomas of Aquin in the schools.\* Dante himself tells us the meaning and object of his poem; and his funda-

\* “St. Thomas of Aquin,” vol. ii. p. 827.

mental idea may be thus stated, as summed up by Franz Hettinger: "The solution of the great, eternal, only problem of our life—the delivery from evil, and the final beatification in God."\* One is tempted here to expound this philosophy as developed through the "Divina Commedia," but space will not allow us to dwell upon it; we must hurry on to other poets more immediately concerned in this essay.

We have mentioned above, among eminent world-poets, Calderon, Christopher Marlowe, and Goethe; and of these three we would especially speak in this paper. The three poets mentioned have chosen to convey their teaching to the world in the interpretation of a hero, a "man of men"—not, as in the case of Dante, the poet himself—but, rather, a typical individual; and this individual, this type, may in a way be said to be the same in all three, and we may call him Faust.

Everybody knows the outline of the Faust story. The learned doctor—the new Solomon—who has exhausted every branch of human learning, who has reached to the uttermost bounds of every science, still finds that his heart is void and unsatisfied. That heart (made, as we know, for God) can be satisfied with nothing less than God. He is precisely the modern materialistic philosopher of our day, arrived at the furthest bounds of the human knowable, and feeling a great want all unsatisfied. Whither shall he turn? whence shall he seek to be satisfied? And here steps in a new power, highly intellectual, mighty—altogether outside of humanity, an individuality, interfering continually, but not always visibly, in human affairs—the Evil Spirit. Like the Serpent with Eve, he offers to the unsatisfied yearning of the doctor, of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, and promises that it shall bring all contentment. But he exacts a terrible condition in exchange for the boon he offers, he requires at the end to receive the soul of the philosopher. The wretched man yields to the strong temptation, and signs the fatal deed. He enters at once upon his enjoyment of new and strange knowledge, vast powers, unlimited license of every kind of pleasure, and runs through several years of intoxication like a summer's day. But in the end he finds that all his wisdom, his power, his delights end in smoke; all is "vanity of vanities," the great void in his nature is still unsatisfied, and the Evil One at last suddenly comes upon him to claim payment of his awful debt.

In one sense, then, Faust is a "man of men;" that is to say, he is typical of human intellect arrived at its fulness of knowledge, but lacking divine grace and faith, and thereby wandering

---

\* "Grundidee and Charakter der göttl. Com." Bonn, 1876, p. 5.

astray and falling in the temptations and delusions of the Evil Spirit. But is there any historical foundation for the concrete individual character of which this is the type?

In the Roman Breviary, on September 26, we have the feasts of SS. Cyprian and Justina, martyrs. Their lessons tell us—

Cyprian, at first a magician, but afterwards a martyr, once endeavoured to win by his charms and spells a Christian virgin Justina, who was beloved by a certain youth. He consulted the demon to know how he might do this. The demon answered that no art would succeed with him against those who really worshipped Christ. Cyprian, moved by this reply, began to lament deeply his past life. And so, leaving his magic arts, he turned himself wholly to the faith of Christ.

The story thus briefly told suggested the subject of a great and immortal tragedy to Spain's greatest poet.

Pedro Calderon de la Barca, who was born in 1602, and died in 1681, was the greatest of Spanish poets. Germany especially has been foremost in recognizing the high rank of Calderon.

Wilhelm v. Schlegel was the first to reveal this poet to his country. He has almost canonized him, to use Sainte-Beuve's expression. Schiller reads him, Goethe imitates him, Schlegel translates him; Gries, his indefatigable disciple, in his turn, gives us a fairly complete copy of the Castilian dramatist; Charles Immermann recasts (on the stage) the "Wonderful Magician."\*

Thanks to Schlegel, and in this country in a great measure to Mr. Denis Florence MacCarthy, the merits of Calderon have become well known to other nations than his own; but we may venture to doubt whether we yet fully realize his superlative greatness. Do we wish to do so, we cannot do better than read his *Faust*—his "Mágico Prodigioso." "After reading this play," says a German critic, "my heart was enlarged; I was in an ecstasy of admiration."† The words are not too strong.

Calderon is above all—and in this he stands beside Dante—essentially a Christian, a Catholic, even a theological poet. Like Goethe's "Faust," like Dante's "Commedia," his "Mágico" is an attempt to solve the great problem of human life. But in this,—like Dante, and unlike Goethe,—his solution is the one based on Christian faith and philosophy; is therefore absolutely true and just; like the "Divina Commedia" again, even minutely accurate in its scholastic phraseology, its theological and philosophical arguments and distinctions. But he does not remain among quibbles and syllogisms—he soars into the highest regions of passion and poetry.

\* Magnabál, Preface to "Mág. Prod.," p. xvii.

† Baumstark, "Excursion to Spain," 1872.

Calderon follows the human heart going astray from God; he follows it even into its greatest aberrations. All the doubts, all the torments, all the sins of the man who tries to fight *alone* against life, he has reproduced in his "Mágico Prodigioso" in a manner which often recalls, even in its minutest details, Goethe's "Faust."\*

True; but strikingly, painfully distinct is the result arrived at by the one poet and by the other. If Calderon is essentially the Christian, Goethe is essentially the natural man.

And what about Christopher Marlowe, whose name we have also mentioned? In what relation does he stand to his two brother-poets?

Christopher Marlowe lived before Calderon. He was born in 1565, and died miserably in a tavern brawl in 1593. A predecessor of Shakespeare, he was "a little less" than the great dramatist. Had Shakespeare never lived, Kit Marlowe would probably have enjoyed a celebrity beyond any English poet. Like Ben Jonson, and others of his contemporaries, he was a giant,—it was an age of giants,—but of course the superlative greatness of Shakespeare has had the effect of causing their greatness to dwindle.

Marlowe was the first in point of time to take up the old Faust legend and immortalize it by his genius. That legend we have roughly traced in its outline already. During the life of Marlowe, there had appeared in Germany a popular collection of the many legends current about Dr. Faustus. The *editio princeps* of this "Faustbuch" appeared in Frankfort in 1587. The book was rapidly translated into various languages, and somehow or another became known to the English dramatist. Professor Ward thinks that his "Dr. Faustus" was certainly founded upon the edition of 1587, and itself first produced on the stage between that year and 1589. Perhaps it was brought to England by some traveller, and Marlowe may have seen a MS. translation of it. Certain it is, as Professor Ward shows, that Marlowe was the first to dramatize the tale, and that all subsequent plays, German or otherwise, were founded on his.

One is here tempted to inquire—Is there any historical foundation for the tale of Dr. Faust? We should not have space even to summarize Professor Ward's examination of this question. Suffice it to say that he establishes, firstly, that, "The supposition . . . that the story of Faustus is a legendary fiction pure and simple, invented as a warning against practices of magic, is altogether untenable. Faust, or Faustus, was a real personage."† Secondly, that "Faust the magician and Faust the printer are the same person, cannot be accepted (p. xxxiv.). But, lastly,

\* Baumstark, *ut sup.*

† Ward, op. cit., p. xxxiii.

that there really existed a certain Dr. Johann Faust, who became famous in public,—some time between the years 1510 and 1540" (p. xlvi.). "This Dr. Faust appears to have been the last of the cosmopolitan type of *scholastici vagantes*" (p. xlvi.).

Concerning this type, Mr. Ward says:—"Formerly students had migrated in masses, or whole bodies of doctrine had been carried from university to university, transplanting part of Paris to Oxford, and of Oxford to Prague; now [i.e., in the period of the Renaissance, at the beginning of the fifteenth century] the individual has become cosmopolitan, and we are in the age of the *scholastici vagantes*, the knight-errants of the new learning, possessed of and practising a multitude of arts, and masters of a mysterious variety of knowledge."\*

"Popular awe and superstition gathered round these men, as round so many Eugene Arams, and all the floating legends of the Middle Ages concerning magic and magicians,—super-human knowledge and powers, gained by diabolical compacts, naturally centred round them; as, in an earlier age, round the great physicist of Oxford, the precursor of modern exact science, the Franciscan friar, Roger Bacon. And, above all, all the wonderful tales which—some of them for centuries—had floated about among the people were fathered upon this last representative of the mediæval magicians [Dr. Johann Faust.] There is accordingly hardly one, if any, incident or feature in the legend of Faustus to which a parallel may not be found in one or more of the legends of his predecessors."†

If we ask whereabouts Dr. J. Faust flourished, the answer is difficult. Various places are connected with him and his exploits. Poda in Saxe-Altenberg, and near Weimar; Anhalt; and, above all, Knütingen—all lay claim, in one legend or another, to be his birthplace. The University of Wittenberg—Luther's university, where the reformer took his degree in 1509, in the time, therefore, of Dr. Faust, of whom there is direct mention in Luther's "Table-Talk"—appears to have been the chief seat of his studies and adventures; though many others, Heidelberg (where a Johann Faustus took the same degree, B.D., in the same year as Luther at Wittenberg), Erfurt, Würzburg, Prague, Ingoldstadt, &c., are said to have been visited by him. His awful death is narrated to have occurred at or near Wittenberg.

But to return to our poets. We have said that Marlowe immortalized the Faust legend. He made it a tragedy of human life, and though without the theological light of Dante or Calderon, his treatment of the great problem is thoroughly Christian.

\* Op. cit., p. xxviii.

† Ward, p. xlvi.

The tragical history of Dr. Faustus opens, like all its successors, like Calderon's "Mágico Prodigioso," like Goethe's "Faust," like modern attempts, themselves imitations of the last named, *e.g.*, Byron's "Manfred," and Longfellow's "Golden Legend"—with the self-same scene. Were space to serve, we should like to quote the opening soliloquies of all these five plays—they are all very fine, and it is surely a rare thing to find five poets handling, each in his own manner, the self-same situation, the self-same ideas. But there is more significance in this than mere similarity. The fact is, that these openings are distinct statements of that great problem of human life which, we have before said, is the subject of the highest poetry. We are shown the natural man arrived at the limit of all human knowledge,—wearied of each study in turn, and finding his heart still unsated—

Sorrow is knowledge ; they who know the most  
Must mourn the deepest o'er the fatal truth :  
The tree of knowledge is not that of life.\*

Did Faustus but know the truth, this yearning in his soul is for a knowledge of God, for the knowledge of enlightened faith, without which the human mind will never be satisfied. But here intervenes a temptation, which carries the restless mind far astray from the right source of satiety. The lust after knowledge still unsated, still increasing, urges its victim after a new kind of knowledge—a knowledge which, according to the popular and misleading axiom, "is power"—that is, a knowledge and a power which are superhuman indeed, meddling with what is beyond nature, but which are certainly not of God. And so Dr. Faustus longs for magical knowledge and powers, and proceeds to invocations whereby to obtain them.

There is a remarkable analogy between the typical Faust and the aberrant intellectual world of our times. Arrived at the ultimate limit and refinement, almost, of human knowledge, we find the intellect of our time utterly dissatisfied, and unsated. "Will the wild ass bray when he hath grass, or will the ox low before a full manger?" (Job vi. 5). And this strange hunger of the purely natural intellect, in a wonderful manner turns to seek its satisfaction after all in spiritualism, in a morbid search after things hidden from human ken, in what, in the Middle Ages, would have been called magic and necromancy. Verily, the legend of Dr. Faustus reads like an apologue of our own contemporaries.

Marlowe has worked out well the subsequent four-and-twenty years, during which Faustus is attended by the mighty demon

---

\* Byron, "Manfred," act i. sc. 1.

Mephistophiles—years of marvellous astrological skill, joined to every kind of preternatural power, and all the fame and all the unlimited opportunities for self-indulgence and sensual pleasure which this power affords. Faust grows inclined to be sceptical. He asks the fiend about hell and its whereabouts, and on Mephistophiles's reply, exclaims:—

Come, I think hell's a fable.

*Meph.* Ay, think so still, till experience change thy mind.

*Fau.* Think'st thou that Faustus is so fond to imagine  
That after this life there is any pain ?

Tush, these are trifles and mere old wives' tales.

(Sc. v. ll. 125-129.)

But notwithstanding his affectation of carelessness, of sarcasm and scepticism, a power is strongly at work in his soul urging him to repent; and great gushes of remorse from time to time break upon him. These are some of the most telling parts of the tragedy. His good angel frequently interposes with his urgent pleadings, but his evil angel or else Mephistophiles himself are at hand to drown feelings of repentance in despair. Here is a telling scene. In the course of one of their conversations, Dr. Faustus asks:—

Tell me who made the world ?

*Meph.* I will not.

*F.* Sweet Mephistophiles, tell me.

*M.* Move me not, for I will not tell thee.

*F.* Villain, have I not bound thee to tell me anything ?

*M.* Ay, that is not against our kingdom ; but this is.

Think thou on hell, Faustus, for thou art damned.

*Enter GOOD ANGEL and EVIL ANGEL.*

*G. A.* Think, Faustus, upon God, that made the world.

*F.* . . . . Is't not too late ?

*E. A.* Too late.

*G. A.* Never too late, if Faustus can repent.

*E. A.* If thou repent, devils shall tear thee in pieces.

*G. A.* Repent, and they shall never raze thy skin.

*F.* Ay, Christ, my Saviour,

Seek to save distressed Faustus' soul.

*Enter LUCIFER.*

*L.* Christ cannot save thy soul, for he is just ;  
There's none but I have interest in the same.

\* \* \* \* \*

We come to tell thee thou dost injure us ;  
Thou talk'st of Christ, contrary to thy promise :  
Thou should'st not think of God ; think of the devil.

And, further on—

Talk not of Paradise, nor creation . . . . talk of  
The devil, and nothing else (Sc. vi. ll. 69, seq.).

Wonderfully true is this anxiety of the Evil One to keep away from Faustus' mind any thought even of God or His mercy. Such moments of remorse occur several times, as when Faustus in the eleventh scene composes himself to sleep, saying, "Christ did call the thief upon the Cross" (l. 43). But frequent as are the stirrings of grace within his heart, the wretched man does not, will not correspond with them, and his graces remain inefficient. At last the end draws near; and here we reach the climax of the tragedy. Professor Ward quotes Mr. Fleay as calling this fourteenth scene "the only dramatic deathbed scene which can be compared in horror to "Henry VI.," iii. 3;\*\* but we will venture much further than this, and say that in tragic awe, in awful realism, it far transcends even the scene in Shakspeare. We know only the Night Scene in "Macbeth"—Lady Macbeth after the murder—that surpasses it. In its wonderful picture of a deathbed attempt at repentance, the strong grace, the urging of friends—and then, after all, the awful despair, the battling against hope, when hope seems easy enough to the outsider, the consciousness of coming damnation, the final impenitence, the last sin against the Holy Ghost—these are limned with mighty hand and powerful colour, in theological accuracy. No wonder that Ben Jonson could extol "Marlowe's mighty line," and that Goethe could "burst out with an exclamation of praise" (at mention of the play), saying: "How greatly it is all planned! I had thought of translating it. I am fully aware that Shakspeare does not stand alone."

Calderon, as we have seen, lived considerably later than Marlowe; and it is highly probable that he may have read Marlowe's great tragedy, at least some version of it.

Of the numerous predecessors of Dr. John Faust, however, Calderon chose St. Cyprian of Antioch, of whose history we have spoken, as the hero of his play. But he made a greater change than this—which was, after all, but a change of the accidentals of name and place, the theme remaining the same. He bound up with the thread of the hero's life, another life, and made the life-tragedy a double one. He introduced Justina, the fair, pure, Christian damsel, with whom Cyprian falls in love, and whom he employs every effort of his superhuman power to win. Hence the double struggle; the struggle in the hero's mind, the struggle in the soul of the heroine. In this Goethe imitated the Spanish poet; and hence the play takes a quite new development, over and above Marlowe's, in their mind. Of Goethe's own immortal work we are not going to speak; it is too trite a subject. We will only refer to its obligations to the "Mágico

---

\* Cardinal Beaufort's.

Prodigioso." Byron, talking to Captain Medwin, said:—" You tell me the plot is almost entirely Calderon's. The fête, the scholar, the argument about the Logos, the selling himself to the fiend and afterwards denying his power, his disguises of the plumed cavalier, the enchanted mirror, are all from Cipriano. That 'Mágico Prodigioso' must be worth reading."

If we attempt a comparison between the mighty "Faust" of Goethe on the one hand, and the great Christian drama, the "Mágico" of Calderon, and, to some extent, Marlowe's "Doctor Faustus," on the other,—we shall find that the contrast is between a non-Christian and a Christian reading of the problem of life. Let us cite some foreign critics in support of this assertion. First, with regard to Goethe and Calderon. Philarète Chasles, in his brilliant study on the Spanish drama, says:—

The drama of Calderon is, above all things, Catholic; it is profoundly and ardently so, with a renouncement of every other pretension, with a serious and passionate exaltation . . . to prove the necessity of grace, the powerlessness of man, the emptiness of passions, the nothingness of earthly love—is everything to him. He ought to be, you would think, very tedious: he is sublime. . . .

On the other hand, M. Bougeault says of Goethe's Faust:—

It was, doubtless, a poetical machine, rather than a conviction of his mind, for, from all the works of this great genius, there does not result a single positive affirmation, a single doctrinal conclusion. . . . He passed into another life to seek the light from on high, uncreated, undying, divine; but he had refused to find its germs here below in religious truth, the anticipated though incomplete revelation of the truth which has no shadow.\*

And the same critic thus compares Goethe and Marlowe:—

Goethe, with his sceptical art, has given his poem a conclusion which loses itself in fantastic vagueness. As regards the moral effect, he is far from that heartrending cry of remorse with which Marlowe inspires his hero at the moment of his supreme crisis. Here is man struggling with his conscience; it is the inward wrestling of the truth against the error of mind and sense; whilst with the German author everything ends in a sort of unreal phantasmagoria, losing itself finally in the clouds of symbolical mythology. The English author keeps to human truth; he is less profound, and less complete, but he moves us more.†

We have seen above how fully and truly Dante has grasped the entire Christian philosophy, which secures him the only true and the only happy solution of the great world-problem. Whilst Goethe's dying exclamation, if it be not apocryphal, as he bade

\* "Histoire des Littératures Etrangères," t. i. pp. 268, 269.

† Op. cit., t. ii. p. 54.

them push back the curtains, "Light, more light," is a significant commentary on the incompleteness and unsatisfactoriness of the solution, which, unaided by Christian philosophy and theology he has worked out in his colossal Faust. After all it may be but a fancy; it has always struck us that there was a mystical significance in the fact that Dante styles his poem "Commedia," as Calderon's is "Comedia," whilst Goethe writes "Eine Tragödie." In Dante's case, this appears bizarre; but he has taken the trouble to explain the reason himself:—"Tragedy is, in the beginning, admirable and calm; but at the end, or in the event, it is foul and glowing. . . . On the contrary, comedy begins untowardly, but ends happily. . . . Hence it follows the present work is called 'Commedia.' For if we look at its matter, at the beginning, it is dreadful and horrible, being in hell; but at the close, happy, desirable, and agreeable, because it is in paradise."\*

And so, whilst the "Mágico Prodigioso," like the "Divina Commedia," ends happily, the ending of Faust leaves to the reader resultant emotions, which are, after all, bitterly melancholy and disappointing. Dante and Calderon had found in their Catholic Philosophy precisely "that positive affirmation" of truth which alone can lead to the *dénouement* of the "Comedy" rather than of the "Tragedy" of life. Marlowe, it is true, also calls his play a tragedy, for it ends most unhappily; not that he was incapable of a happy solution of his plot, but because his gloomy and tragical genius impelled him to end with a scene of unrivalled horror.

To return to our subject. The Christian religion teaches us that man must work out the problem of his life by means of the two faculties of his soul, Intellect and Free Will; not indeed unaided and of their own strength, but with the help and support of Divine grace.

I. The *Intellect*, in the first place, tends naturally towards truth. But the highest kind of natural truth is the natural knowledge of God; and this knowledge alone can satisfy it. So Dante acknowledges in reply to Beatrice:—"I clearly see that our intellect is never sated until that truth illume it, outside of which no truth strayeth. In this it rests, as the beast of prey in his lair, so soon as it hath reached it, and reach it, it can,—else were every natural desire vain" ("Parad." iv. 124). So, too, Calderon puts into the mouth of Cipriano whilst yet a heathen, this natural yearning for the highest truth: "This question which keepeth my soul in suspense . . . for my intellect findeth not this God, in whom so many mysteries and indications meet.

---

\* "Epist. dedicat ad Can. Grand."

This hidden truth must I sound to its depths ("Mágico," jornada i. sc. 2.)

Now Goethe's Faust, at the opening of the tragedy, is indeed wearied and dissatisfied with all his acquirements, and feels still a great want. He has studied philosophy, law, medicine, even theology; and alas! stands "like a poor fool, and is as wise as at the beginning." But here the poet himself has failed to find out what precisely is this great want, that leaves Faust's soul hungry and thirsty. True, once, and once only, does the real answer rise to Faust's lips:—

The message hear I clearly, *but Faith alone doth fail me.*

But herein the poet acknowledges his own real inability to rise to the solution of the problem: the confession is too transient and too lightly uttered to be of any permanent significance.

Turning once more to the Christian doctrine, this *natural* faculty of the intellect needs, in order to attain its object fully, the assistance of revelation and illuminating grace, lifting it up to a *supernatural* knowledge of God. Hence Dante tells us that "the *natural* thirst is never quenched except by the water for which the Samaritan woman begged" ("Purg." xxi. 1). And Cipriano, after his long gropings after truth, and even his servitude to the Evil One, at the supreme moment of struggle, by an act of full confidence and hope in the yet unknown God, draws down this illuminating grace, which fills his soul, makes him a Christian, a victor over Satan, and a martyr ("Mágico," iii. 16 seq.), whilst it is just here that Faust fails and is overcome.

II. The second natural power, by which we are to work out our life-problem, is *Free Will*. This faculty tends to the good. Dante tells us that:

The greatest gift which God, by His largesse  
Gave in Creation, which to His goodness is  
The most conformed, and what He prizes most,  
Is of our Will the liberty; with which  
All these His creatures who have intellect,  
And those alone are dowered. ("Parad." v. 19-24.)

It is to be remarked that with both Goethe and Calderon the struggle of the Free Will is carried on rather in the heroine than in the hero. This is a point of high artistic skill in the Spanish poet, to whom no doubt the German was indebted for it. Comparing their treatment, however, we find that whilst the sad fall of poor Margaret is the pathos of Faust, the steadfast constancy and glorious victory of Justina is the very turning-point of "El Mágico." Now it is precisely through the failure of her free will that Gretchen falls to the passion and will of Faust, to whom her last words—the supreme moment of temptation and

surrender—are: "I know not what it is *drives me after thy will!*" How different with Calderon! In the very first scene, Justina triumphs in and by her Free Will. The Devil seeks to terrify her into submission: "If some strange science," says he, "exercise its force in thee, how canst thou resist, Justina, if it bend thee with such violence that it *force* thee whither it tends?" "By knowing how to avail myself of my Free Will," is her calm reply. "My might will force it." "Then would it be no longer Free Will, if it suffered itself to be forced." And so the Devil is completely baffled. ("Mágico," iii. 5).

Moreover, as the Intellect, so the Will needs divine grace for its final triumph, and to attain supernatural virtue or "true charity" ("Parad." x. 83). And so Justina, at the crisis of the attack, calls upon God's help when the Demon seizes her, and the Fiend is forced to flee, crying out "Thou hast conquered, O Woman, thou hast conquered!" ("Mágico," l. c.).

To sum up the life-stories presented to us by the great poets cited:—Cipriano and Justina, Dante and Beatrice—the latter at once his beloved and the type of divine grace—have, with God's help and the exertion of their natural faculties, triumphed over the flesh and world and Devil, and attained the double end of happiness for which they were destined. Faust and Gretchen have miserably succumbed and fallen. But their history has to be patched up into some semblance of final felicity, for Goethe's artistic taste could not have been content with the gloomy and terrible, yet consistent and logical, ending that suited Marlowe's weird genius. And so Margaret is indeed saved by a touching repentance; but Faust himself, at the close of the second part, is almost ludicrously saved, without his own co-operation, or rather in spite of himself. This essentially false and unnatural finale betrays the utter failure of Goethe's life-theory, or indeed of any philosophy of life, except the Christian one, as so happily and successfully developed by the great Christian poets of Italy and Spain, and to some extent also by the Englishman, Christopher Marlowe.

L. C. CASARTELLI.

---

## ART. II.—MODERN MEXICO.

1. *Mexico to-day.* By THOMAS UNETT BROCKLEHURST. London : John Murray. 1883.
2. *Mexico.* By C. SARTORIUS. London : Trübner. 1855.
3. *Aus Mexico.* Von FRIEDRICH RATZEL. Breslau. 1878.

**N**OWHERE is the future of empire more clearly marked out than in the great isthmus territory of the Spanish Main styled by Humboldt, "the bridge of the commerce of the world."

The mountain breakwater between two oceans—the crag-built causeway between two continents—the gangway of the eastern and western, the northern and southern hemispheres—this lordly land enthroned on Andes seems destined by Nature to be the toll-gate of nations. For hitherward is now tending that advancing wave of population and progress, whose secular tide is ever impelled westward by some hidden law of human gravitation.

The group of confederate States constituting the Republic of Mexico occupies, roughly speaking, a horn-shaped segment of the American mainland, embracing in its concave that great ocean cauldron, the overflow of whose heated waters tempers the eternal frosts of the remote shores of Nova Zembla. Here, where the rearing continent narrows to the south, it lifts its gathered mountain bulk terrace above terrace, in superimposed ridges of Andes, to form the gigantic *tête-du-pont* of the Isthmus of Darien. In the shallow trough between these opposing crests, at an altitude of from six to nine thousand feet, high above the lower world as the burning rafters of the sunset, lie the great Mexican plateaus of Chihuahua and Anáhuac, the frigid regions of the tropics, fenced with eternal snows beneath a vertical sun. This extensive table-land is nearly level, with only a gradual slope to the north, for a distance equal to that from Lyons to the Tropic of Cancer, and as Humboldt says, a wheeled carriage can run from Mexico to Santa Fé, by a high level route at the altitude of the St. Gotthard Pass, long enough to connect Geneva with Constantinople. The descent is very steep from this uplifted territory to the low coast lands, whose inclined plane from fifty to a hundred miles in width, dipping at a small angle to either ocean, forms the glacis of the great scarp of the Cordilleras.

From sea to sea, athwart the axis of these main ridges, are studded, like a chain of watch-towers, the great volcano-pyramids of Mexico, the models of its fire-crested temples; Orizava,

"the peak of the burning star," the beacon of the Gulf of Mexico, round whose frosted cone a halo of lambent flame is sometimes seen to play; Popocatepetl, "the mountain that smokes," still so-called though no breath goes up to heaven from its silent snows; its twin peak, the White Woman, cold and lifeless too as a sheeted corpse in her frozen shroud; Jorullo, a monstrous mushroom-birth of mountain, 1,600 feet high, protruded from the groaning flank of a luxuriant valley in a night of earthquake and conflagration, September 28, 1759; and Colima, seen from the Pacific shores, trailing its vaporous plume across the tropical blue.

Such is, roughly speaking, the skeleton outline of the country taken in trans-continental profile from Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico, and thence to the western ocean. Thus built up in stages from the Equatorial seas to the regions of perpetual frost, it is in climate and productions an epitome of the universe. Zone above zone, an uplifted world hangs aslant on the mountain scaffolding of the Cordilleras, and between the secular snows of Orizava and the steaming shores of the Caribbean Sea, we traverse, in seventy miles of distance, the entire gamut of terrestrial temperature and vegetation. For here—to quote Humboldt once more—we have climates in layers, and cross thermal belts in perpendicular instead of horizontal plane.

The ordinary division of the country into three regions—the *Tierras Calientes*, *Templadas*, and *Frias* (hot, temperate, and cold lands)—is convenient for purposes of description, but is not always adhered to by the inhabitants, and in some places at least, they recognize only the two extremes, divided by a very uncertain and fluctuating line of demarcation. The first zone, extending from the coast to a height of 3,000 feet, with a mean temperature of 77° Fahr., is of torrid heat and character; the next, between 3,000 and 5,000 feet, though called temperate, is really tropical and sub-tropical, with a mean temperature of 68° to 70°; the third, the "cold," but more properly the temperate region, includes the central plateaus, reaching their maximum elevation of 8,450 feet in the valley of Toluca, and its thermal mean may be taken as 64°, that of the city of Mexico. At 11,000 feet vegetation ceases, the *Pinus Montezumiae*, the highest growing forest-tree, being last to disappear, and at 14,700 feet is reached the perennial ice-cap of Orizava, eighteen to twenty feet in thickness at its lower edge. The regularity of this ascending scale is broken by a singular feature of the landscape, the stupendous chasms or barrancas yawning to a depth of 2,000 or 3,000 feet athwart it, and on the narrow strip of sunken floor fenced by their cloven precipices, carrying the torrid climate of the coast far into the heart of the highlands.

The stagnation of air and reverberation of sun within their walls, renders them perfect heat-rivers; and the Indian, who builds his reed hut at the bottom of the green abyss, or shelters himself in the caves in its flanks, rears the luscious fruits of the coast within a few hours' toilsome journey of the great cities of the plateaus. Necessarily formidable obstacles to communication, they are in some places spanned by natural viaducts. Across the ravine of the Atayac, in the Valley of Puebla, rocks fallen from either side have met at an obtuse angle, and, by a singular coincidence, the same accident has even repeated itself some thirty feet overhead, so that two natural pointed arches, one over the other, form a double bridge, called by the natives *El Puente de Dios*.

To the traveller reaching Mexico by the ordinary sea-route, its boasted fertility seems belied by its first appearance. No golden gate, but a leaden portal, is here, to mask the approach to the treasury of Nature. The province of Vera Cruz, he has been told, produces all the cereals of the temperate and all the spices of the torrid zone, its jungle growths distil precious balsams, its forests yield the ornamental woods of commerce, the golden fruitage of the tropics ripen beneath its vertical sun, and its teeming soil returns sixty or eighty to one of wheat, and two hundred and fifty to three hundred of maize. The Indian, who merely inserts the seed of the latter grain in the rudely-cleared ground, reaps a triple annual harvest, as it ripens irrespective of seasons at the end of ninety days.

Yet Vera Cruz itself, a group of grey towers and cupolas, girt by a sea-shaken wall, stands in an arid desert, and the chill "norther" that comes blackening over the Gulf, blotting out its blue horizon, whirls before it dense clouds of sand, like the simoom of the Sahara. Unlike the simoom, however, it is the harbinger of health, sweeping the poison of the dread *vomito prieto*, or yellow fever, from the streets of the pestiferous city, where the black *zapilotes* are the only sanitary officers, and the open drains furnish a perpetual *table d'hôte* of garbage to these scavenger vultures.

To north and south the turquoise sea laps against long curves of coral sand, backed by the pale crests of the dunes, ever shifting, as the wind remoulds them at its pleasure. Their continuous rampart bars the inland waters from their natural egress to the sea, and dams them back upon the reeking soil in stagnant lagoons and marshes. Characteristic vegetation flourishes in the succulent soil, plants of exuberant foliage, the wild plantain, and aroidæ with huge, arrow-shaped leaves, abound on the land, the standing pools are studded with gleaming water-lilies and blue pontederia, and the sluggish streams are edged with a mighty sedge growth by the *tarros* or *caña vaquera*, which

rustles its pale-green pennons thirty or forty feet above the water. Here lurks the ungainly caiman, the crocodile of the west, his ridgy back scarce showing above the unctuous ooze; here the rosy-winged flamingo stalks among the sedge, and adjutant birds, black and white, sit in rows on the branches of the Indian fig overshadowing the inky waters.

Here, too, is a congenial home for such creeping things as are enumerated by Madame Calderon de la Barca, a Scotch lady married to a Spanish diplomatist, "a lively observer of men, manners, and millinery," as she has been called. Her list is a formidable one, including *alacrans*, or scorpions; a gaily-striped viper, the *chicalillo*; the *coralillo*, a black-headed red snake; the *vinagrillo*, an orange-hued cricket, leaving a strong smell of vinegar behind it; the *esclaboncillo*, which dies of spite if prevented from stinging; the *salamenquesa*, whose bite is fatal; and the *cencoatl*, a creature with five legs, which shines in the dark. Spiders, too, are numerous, among others the *cenclaquilla*, a beautiful red-and-black variety, whose bite, producing pains in the bones, requires for its cure several days seclusion in a dark room thick with smoke; and the fat, black-haired tarantula, said to cause the loss of the hoof of a horse which treads on it. Dr. Ratzel, a recent German traveller whose book is among our headings, in riding through a forest, saw a tree which seemed to him to be swathed in bearskin, but which proved on examination to have a living mantle of hairy spiders covering it completely. The natives sometimes revenge themselves on their numerous tormentors by devouring them in turn. Roast viper is a remedy for skin diseases; even the scorpion is eaten after extracting its sting; and the fat larva the size of a man's finger which burrows in the cactus leaves, is sold in Mexico, and when fried in butter is said to taste like eel.

Population is scanty in the hot plains, and it is only at long intervals that the traveller comes upon a clump of bananas, waving their broad banners of pale-green satin, and hanging huge clusters of yellowing pods over the bamboo hut of the Zambo, the lazy, light-hearted compound of negro and Indian blood. Lazy he can surely afford to be, since fourteen days' labour in the year suffices for the maintenance of his family; and his banana garden of an acre, which under wheat, would only yield food for two or three human beings, can, if necessary, here support fifty. His artificial wants are few. A bundle of mats and some earthenware pots constitute his household furniture; and a banjo, constructed in primitive fashion from a gourd, satisfies his artistic cravings. Such as he is, he represents the only branch of the human family that can live and thrive in the sweltering atmosphere of the Mexican lowlands.

It is only at a height of 500 feet and upwards that the luxuriance of tropical vegetation is developed by the abundant moisture, cloud-borne from the Gulf of Mexico, to condense on the slopes of the Cordilleras. In this forest-zone we have the same reversal of the ordinary conditions of Nature, the same wild saturnalia of the plant world, the same tumultuous upheaval of vegetable life, as elsewhere under similar conditions. For here nothing is content to be lowly, nothing will submit to be obscure; the leaf dyes itself in the gaudy tints of the blossom, the blossom mimics the forms of animal life, the very weeds aspire and spurn the soil, to roost like birds among the trees; earth is bare, and the boughs are draped in blossom. Everything struggles upwards and outwards, battling with its neighbours for sun and space; the great *palma real*, or king palm, springs to the audacious height of 100 feet before it shakes against the sky its unbound sheaf of plumes; its congeners, the corozo and fan and wax palms strive after it in vain; arborescent shrubs, bananas with fluttering scarves of puckered green silk, magnolias with white goblets of perfume amid foliage that seems carved in gleaming bronze, and daturas with creamy cornucopias reversed, attain the size of forest trees; while a nondescript mass of parasitic vegetation, writhing up trunks, streaming over boughs, smothering foliage under its vampire growth, linking tree to tree by cable bridges spanning the dusky aisles between, interlaces all the forest together in a universal tangle of riotous confusion. Coral trumpets, the haunt of the humming-bird, wave from a bough which the bignonia has clasped with its sinewy stem; frail cups are shed among dark foliage by an intrusive convolvulus intertwined with it, pale waxen censers swing from a branch that rocks an orchis in the air; here a red spike of blossom is thrust like a tongue of flame from a coil of green; there the scarlet vine wraps the sustaining trunk in a fiery embrace; growth lives upon growth, and plant preys upon plant, in chaotic defiance of all law and order.

Bayard Taylor\* describes the vegetation on the Pacific slopes, as a torrent of verdure pouring down inclines and ravines, while the creepers, topping the highest trees, wave and toss in sprays of lighter green above them, like foam-crests on the forest billows. By night "the embalmed darkness" of the tropical jungle is crossed by the flying gleams of the *cocuyas*, those fire-beetles whose quick flashes, taken by the enemy for the matchlocks of a surrounding army, once lit the followers of Cortes to victory. These woods supplied most of the curious plants collected in the gardens of the Aztec monarchs and thence transferred to

\* "El Dorado." By James Bayard Taylor. New York. 1850.

Europe, where the idea of similar botanical nurseries was quickly adopted.

But amid the marvels of tropical vegetation no sight is so welcome to the traveller as that of the Mexican oak, since its appearance at some 2,500 feet above the sea marks the limit of that scourge of the eastern coast, the yellow fever. Fifteen hundred feet higher stands Jalapa, the sanatorium of Vera Cruz, in a region described as a strip of Paradise fallen on earth. Here all the fruits of the globe may be cultivated side by side, and the Indian villages present a charming spectacle, embowered in the papaws and plantains of the tropics mixed with the oranges and pomegranates of Southern Europe, while their plots of ground are gay with the roses and lilacs, the dahlias and fuchsias of an English garden.

At 5,000 feet above the coast, the banana, the bounteous bread-giver of the tropics disappears, and its place is taken by the cereals of the north. The plateau of Puebla, a great plain waving with golden grain, is in the Tierras Frias, since it lies at an elevation of 7,000 feet. The voluminous leafage of the torrid zone has here shrunk to the sparser foliage of a harsh scrubby bush, characteristic of the table lands. Thorny stemmed mezquite or dwarf-acacia, feathered with minute foliage and producing beans much used for cattle, and mimosas,\* breaking in summer into a frothy bloom of salmon or sulphur colour, are mixed with fleshy-lobed prickly cactuses like vegetable polyps, with euphorbias that mimic their grotesque forms, and with spiky aloes whose scythe-like blades are set with curving teeth like a crocodile's jaw. This defensive armour of its vegetation, makes an attempt to penetrate the Mexican *chapparal* or bush, anything but a pleasing experience for man or beast.

Yet these unfriendly-looking growths are among the most useful, for the cactus is "the vegetable spring in the wilderness" of Humboldt, and the cattle breaking off the woolly tops of the echino-cacti, construct for themselves a drinking fountain in the hollow thus made, which yields a liquid supply for weeks. The mezquite produces fodder and fuel, and the aloe food, drink, and clothing, its heart being eaten, its sap fermented, and its fibres woven into coarse cloth.

The Pass of the Rio Frio, 8,000 to 9,000 feet high, separates the Valley of Mexico from the adjacent plateaus, and on crossing its mountain threshold, the grey and tawny levels of the celebrated basin gradually unroll before the eye. From this point Cortes first saw before him the goal of his ambition and his rapacity—the fair, strange city, the Venice of the West, which

---

\* Mexico has some hundreds of species of acacia and mimosa.

he called in his enthusiasm "the most beautiful thing in the world," as with its palaces and gardens, its mighty temples and saerificial towers, it floated like a mirage on the tremulous waters of its great salt lake.

The glamour of a mysterious past overhangs this central plateau of Anáhuac. Here it was that the invading Spaniard stood bewildered in presence of a civilization, whose medley of some familiar elements was rendered more marvellous by its intermixture with much that was utterly strange and new. Here was found a system of figurative writing recalling that of the Egyptians, an astronomical accuracy in the measurement of time beyond that of mediæval Europe, a series of symbols for the epochs of the calendar identical with those in use throughout Eastern Asia, and architecture so closely allied to that of the Assyrians, that the huge teocalli of the Mexican sun-god is believed by antiquarians to have reproduced the plan of the great Babylonian temple of Bel. And strangest of all, there existed here, in monstrous juxtaposition with the most sanguinary rites that have ever polluted humanity, not only glimpses of a purer theology and a higher morality, but also some fragments of Hebrew tradition, a ceremony analogous to baptism, and even a dim foreboding of Christianity. For side by side with such hideous idols as are evolved from the fantastic imagination of the savage, the Cross was here revered as an object of worship, and associated with it was the strange legendary belief that one day, brought by strangers as a religious emblem from afar, it should supplant and overthrow the ancient faiths of Anáhuac.

But the Aztec, when led to found the city of Tenochtitlan, the modern Mexico, on the spot indicated by a singular omen—an eagle perched on a cactus clutching a serpent with beak and claw, the device to this day of the Republic of Mexico\*—found, but did not originate, the civilization he adopted. To his predecessors, the Toltecs, a shadowy race whose presence on the soil of Mexico is as inexplicable as their disappearance from it, and who flitted over the land, leaving as their monuments vast ruins engulfed in vast forests—to this mysterious people modern science ascribes the importation from their Asiatic home of the arts and sciences inherited by their conquerors. That the Aztec had been subjected to Asiatic influence however derived, seems clear for many reasons, but the evidence of language alone is conclusive. The number of Sanskrit roots found in the Mexican language is too great to be explained as a coincidence, and, from among many,

\* The same combination of eagle and serpent or dragon, also found on Greek coins, formed the portent disregarded by Hector in the twelfth book of the "Iliad" (201-2), a passage which suggested the symbolical opening of the "Revolt of Islam."

we give a few as specimens.\* *Chichi* to suck, Sans., *chush*; *meya*, to flow or trickle, Sans., *mih*; *mate*, to know, Sans., *medh*; *choloa*, to run or leap, Sans., *char*; *tatli*, father, Sans., *tata*; *atoya*, a river, Sans., *udyā*. The Aztec *pilli*, a son or child, comes very close to the European *fils*, *figlio*, &c., while *pepeyal*, poplar, and *papalotl*, butterfly, recall equally obvious parallels.

The Valley of Mexico, an oval basin some sixty-seven leagues in circumference, lying 7,600 above the sea, forms a vast natural amphitheatre, a fitting stage for one of the most striking dramas in history. Its irregular rampart of porphyry and basalt crag is over-topped at one point by two stupendous volcano watch-towers, lifting their sheeted snows far into the sapphire blue. Yet despite this general grandeur of outline, it is wanting in many of the minor harmonies of beauty. The attenuated air lends no softening veil to distance—no magic of mystery to the horizon. The sheer rays of the vertical sun efface all tender modulations of surface and hue in a shadowless uniformity of glare. Moreover, the scene is no longer the same as when the fierce Castilian wooer stood enamoured of its beauty. The shrinkage of the six lakes which still occupy a tenth of its surface, has left exposed round each an unsightly fringe of saline marsh. The Spaniard—ruthless exterminator of trees as of men—has denuded the landscape of timber; and the universal cultivation of the aloe (most picturesque of plants where self-sown amid rocks and precipices, most harsh and unlovely when artificially reared as an agricultural product) imparts its character of weird scantiness to the remaining vegetation.

The volcanic nature of the soil is evidenced by the sulphurous fumes exhaled by the lakes at the southern extremity of the valley; and the wind from this quarter, symbolized in the Aztec writing by a death's head, wafts the odour of sulphuretted hydrogen to the city, and is dreaded as unhealthy. The conformation of the plain, that of a stupendous tazza uplifted on a mountain pedestal, has suggested the theory that it formed one vast eruptive crater, on a scale recalling those of the lunar landscape. It absorbs its own rainfall, sending but one inconsiderable stream, the Tula, to the Gulf of Mexico; and canal works of the most gigantic magnitude have been carried out to create a freer outlet for its waters and avert the danger of inundation from the capital. The streets, which are nearly flush with the salt lake Tezcuco, are frequently submerged after rain, and the marshy

\* "Anáhuac." By Edward B. Tylor. London: Longmans. 1861.

† The Mexican Government has now contracted for the replanting of the Valley of Mexico with two million of trees, within four years, beginning from March 15, 1884.—*Times*, July 27, 1883.

ooze on which they are built occasionally sinks beneath them, causing visible architectural dislocation. Though the gorgeous modern cathedral stands on the site of the great *teocalli*, dedicated to the Aztec war-god in 1486 with a hideous massacre of 70,000 human victims, Mexico is no longer islanded among the waters as was the lake city of Montezuma, accessible from the land only by three long causeways. The salt tide that rocked it has withdrawn, leaving a tract of barren briny marsh, several miles in extent, where towers and palaces were once mirrored in the wave. Such a site is scarcely likely to be a healthy one, and Mexico is not a sanatorium. The rarefied air produces pulmonary disease, and the want of drainage favours the spread of contagion. Thus, in 1799 and in 1830, there were respectively 9,000 and 12,000 deaths from small-pox; and in 1825 15,000 from measles and scarlatina. Ophthalmic affections, attributed by the inhabitants to the vivid hue of scarlet flowering plants like the geranium, are common, and leprosy is not unknown. It is said too, we know not with what truth, that no European woman can reside uninterruptedly in Mexico city for more than three years without her reason becoming affected.

Rising many-towered and sunlit from the plain, its distant aspect recalls to some travellers that of Oxford, to others that of Florence. It is, however, larger than either; and its population of 300,000, the same as under the Aztec empire, is nearly equal to that of Rome. Its social characteristics resemble rather those of Naples, where the traces of Spanish occupation are conspicuously visible. There are in both the same domestic seclusion of the ladies, and concentration of all gregarious life into the public carriage promenade; the same in-door slatternliness and out-door magnificence; the same *al fresco* habits of the lower orders, and universal love of gambling among all. Many minor traits, too, are common to both cities—such as the substitution of pantomime for speech, the presence under the porticoes of public scribes, here quaintly called *evangelisti*, the practice of driving the cows into the city to be milked at the house-doors, and various other details of street life. Nor are the lazzaroni without their prototypes, who are found in the *leperos*, a class not less characteristic of Mexico. More repulsive, however, than the jovial proletarian of Santa Lucia or the Mercatello is the Mexican street-prowler—a very human jackal, slouching, predatory, unclean and degraded, as the pariah-dog of Constantinople. An instance of their versatility in fraud is given by Mr. Brocklehurst, in the interesting and valuable work on Mexico which we have taken as our text.

He tells how, during his stay, the senior magistrate of the city of Mexico being asked the hour by a friend in the street,

exclaimed aloud that he had forgotten his watch, and left it hanging beside his bed.

A thief having overheard this remark, bought a turkey and took it to the house of the magistrate, sending in word to madame that master had sent a turkey, and requested that she would send him his watch, which he had left in his bedroom; this, in her simplicity, she did. On the magistrate's return in the evening, his wife observed, "Thank you for the turkey; but I have not ordered it to be cooked to-night, as another dinner was prepared." The explanation revealed the loss of the watch. But this was not all. On the following day, an accomplice of the thief called at the house and said, "The magistrate has had his watch returned to him, and he begs you to send him the turkey, that it may be offered in evidence against the prisoner." Of course when the magistrate arrived at home in the evening, he found that he was *minus* both watch and turkey; and, moreover, the tale got bruited about, and both he and his household lost the credit which should attach to one in his important position.

The author, however, appends some striking instances of Mexican honesty in the return of stray articles of his own property.

Mexico is distinguished from all European cities by the presence of a large coloured population, representing a social stratum lower than the lowest class of white inhabitants. The native Indians, descendants of a once imperial race, occupy the suburb of Tlatelolco, the scene, at the time of the Spanish invasion, of the great market so eloquently described by Prescott, where all the products of the fantastic civilization of Anáhuac were displayed to a concourse of 30,000 people. Instead of the varied assortment of delicate fabrics, and elaborate metal-work, and luxurious viands, enumerated in his pages, there are now to be seen rude pottery, and primitive mats and baskets, toys of wood or feather work, simple preparations of maize, such as *atole*, a sort of sweetened porridge, and *tortillas*, flat hearth-cakes, of universal consumption. These wares, with ducks and fowls, live sandpipers, and humming-birds (*chupa-mirtos*) in grass cages, form the principal stock-in-trade of the vendors.

In the adjoining streets the mild, sad-looking, cinnamon-hued people may be seen sleeping on the pavement or picnicking in the sun. Their *itacate*, or supply of food carried in a net, consists of *totopo*, stale maize bread, boiled beans wrapped in leaves, or salt fish with Spanish pepper. Their life is to a great extent amphibious, passed in wading among the marshes, catching small fish, frogs, and *achalotes*, a compound of frog and lizard, also used for food; or poling their flat boats among the sedgy canals, gathering frog-spawn, water-cresses, and other aquatic productions. Among the most singular of these are the eggs of a fly, called in their language *axayacatl* (water-face), which lays

them on Lake Tezeuco in such quantities as to form a kind of stone like travertine when imbedded in the calcareous deposits. This substance, known as *ahuauhli* (water-wheat), is sold in lumps like fish-roe, and eaten either raw or fried.

Indian girls, with garlands of poppies and corn-flowers on their dark hair, paddle their *chalupas* smothered and enwreathed in flowers as though for a floral procession, along the Viga Canal, whose stream, starred with water-lilies, orange, pink, and crimson, connects the salt waters of Lake Tezeuco with the fresh-water Lakes Chaleo and Xochimilco. The name of the latter, signifying, "in the flower plantation," is derived from the water-borne market-gardens of Mexico, singular creations of native industry, which existed in thousands at the time of the Conquest, and are proved, by the illuminated tribute rolls of Montezuma, to have furnished a considerable revenue to the Aztec rulers. The surface of the two last-mentioned sheets of water is covered with a matted growth of weeds several feet in thickness, and capable of supporting the weight of a man, though undulating beneath it like young ice. The *chinampas*, or floating-gardens, are created by binding the reeds and sedges together, and adding on successive layers of artificial soil until the surface is raised two or three feet above the water, for a length of one or two hundred feet. These strips called *cintas*, ribbons, are generally staked in their places by willow poles, which take root in the bottom, but if free and movable, are styled *bandaleros*, rovers. Some are large enough to afford pasture for animals, and to contain the dwellings of the proprietors, who are taxed for the maintenance of channels for navigation by constant cutting of the weed. They are irrigated by being frequently splashed with water from the lake, and are very productive. Not, however, the wonder growths of the tropics, but the most prosaic of vegetables, cabbages, carrots, and turnips, are reared on these islets, while homely border flowers, pinks and balsams, and larkspur and sweet-pea, are planted round their edges. They furnish the daily floral decorations of the *pulquerias* and other shops, as well as Brobdingnagian bouquets, sold for a shilling, and consisting principally of roses, perennially blooming, but scentless, like all other flowers in the rarefied air of the plateaus.

Diversity of race, and distinctiveness of dress, give animation to the streets of Mexico. The fashionable dandy still wears the full *charro*, or national costume—the wide *sombrero* laced with silver, short jacket, and pantaloons fastened down the seams with massive silver buttons, while his curveting nag is caparisoned with a silver-embossed, high-peaked saddle, that has cost a thousand or two of dollars, and his bit and stirrups are plated with the precious metals. The coquettish *poblana*, with stockingless

slipped feet, showing under her *enagua*, or bright-coloured skirt, is clad as to the upper part of her person, in a white cotton camisole, low in the neck, short in the sleeve, and unconfined save by a girdle at the waist, while her head and shoulders are draped in the universal *rebozo*, a long scarf, blue or gossamer-coloured, fastened to the back-hair and falling in front, or with one end flung backward over the opposite shoulder, partly concealing the face. The brown bare-footed Indian woman, similarly attired, but in coarser materials, has her *rebozo* most frequently tied round her neck to sling a chubby baby on her back. The Creole dame, her black lace mantilla shading her olive cheek and delicate profile, is the only figure that recalls the Old World; and even her surroundings have a semi-Oriental character, for her dwelling is built in the Hispano-Moresco style, with a *patio* or internal court adorned with tropical flowers and plants, and an *azotea* or flat roof on which to take the air.

But however picturesque may be city life in Mexico, it is the rural aspect of the country that most interests a stranger, and no traveller thinks his visit complete, unless it include a glimpse of life on one of those great demesnes, originally created by extensive grants of land to the conquerors. The *hacienda*, with a fortified enclosure for its buildings and offices, ought to comprise at least 20,000 acres, and some have a superficial area of fifty Spanish square miles. Tillage and grazing estates are called respectively *hacienda de labor*, and *de ganado*, horned-cattle and sheep being distinguished as *ganado mayor* and *menor*. The hacienda of Tepencasco, the property of the Tejira family, visited by Mr. Brocklehurst, was principally a dairy farm, but had also land under tillage. The correspondent of *Harper's Magazine*, who shared his visit, describes it in the pages of that journal for March, 1882, as follows:—

The house was approached from the main road through fields of the purple-flowering alfalfa, a larger and hardier clover, past a dark-walled corral or cattle yard, a very long steeped-roofed barracks for labourers' quarters, and by a pond embowered in willows. From a distance, with its numerous outbuildings, it had the appearance of a ducal residence. It is plainer when reached, the place immediately in front having a farm-yard appearance, and containing in the centre a very large stone threshing-floor, of the kind in which it is customary to thresh out grain as in the *patios*—by troops of running horses. It is of rubble stone, plastered and neatly white-washed; a single liberal story in height, the part devoted to the residence having large windows covered with gratings and a belfry on the top. To this are added on the flanks such a collection of granaries and corrals that a façade is made of probably three hundred feet in length. Some fonts project from the wall beside a door opening into the family chapel. Over the main entrance-door is an inscription—

*En aqueste destierro y soledad disfruto del tesor della paz.* ("In this retirement and solitude I enjoy the treasure of peace.") Each principal granary or barn (called *troje*) is inscribed also with its title. They are built, to keep the contents cool and of an even temperature, with walls of great thickness. Buttressed without, and with columns or piers of a yard square running down the long dim interiors, they are more like basilicas of the early Christians than one's preconceived idea of a barn. The buildings in the central clump, not counting those detached, alone cover between four and five acres of ground. The estate, of which they are the focal point, is eighteen miles in one dimension, by six in the other, and contains not less than forty thousand acres.

Cheese to the value of £2,500, and £800 worth of butter, are annually sent to market. The cattle, some 2,000 head, are hornless, the horn being seared when sprouting. Forty ploughmen unyoke their teams at night, and the ploughed land yields on an average, 15,000 bushels of maize, 4,000 of barley, and 1,000 of wheat. While manure is scarcely ever required for the soil of Mexico, artificial irrigation is a necessity for the growth of cereals, and eleven large dams and reservoirs, one a lake (Zupitlan) two miles in length, supply the hacienda of Tepecasco. The celebrated spring of San Dionisio, mentioned by Humboldt, is also on its territory; but it has only the use of the water for seventy-hours in the week, two neighbouring villages having joint rights over it.

A hundred and fifty men and boys are employed under the overseership of a major-domo, besides three captains, and twenty men and boys, in care of the cattle. The principal functionaries are mounted, and Don Rafael, the administrator, has a salary of 1,000 dollars a year, and houses and farms of his own, with the *mayordomo* and *sobresaliente* as his lieutenants. The *pastero* has charge of the pastures, the *caporal* of the stock, and the *aguador* of the water-works. Don Angel, the book-keeper, administers a revenue of 20,000 dollars a year. A sentry is stationed on the roof night and day, and the walls are loopholed for musketry.

The *peons*, or native labourers, are miserably lodged, and are practically serfs. A *tienda*, or store, is always an adjunct of the hacienda, where they are supplied with necessaries on credit, pledging their own labour, and even that of their children, as security, and thus contracting themselves and their posterity out of liberty. There is a prison, too, on the premises, to which the refractory are consigned for short terms, an illegal but perhaps necessary exercise of authority, without which it is said they would not work.

The routine of the establishment is thus described by Mr. Brocklehurst:—

At whatever hour you rose you found chocolate and an immense basket of buns and sweet cakes in the dining-room. A painfully elaborate midday dinner was served about noon, and repeated again in the evening at nine. I amused the family one day by asking to write down the bill of fare, which commenced with large cups of broth and green aguacaté (*Laurus Persea*), a pear-shaped vegetable, which you generally spread in its raw state on bread as you would butter; then followed a thick soup full of vegetables; then a jambalaya of stewed rice and gravy, with hot pepper-pods upon it; a large dish of beef boiled to threads, and, in place of gravy, a garnishing of roast apples, sweet bananas, and fried potatoes, quite an *olla podrida*; pigs' feet in sweet white sauce like custard; mushrooms in gravy; roast fowls and salad; the end of dinner being always the frijoles or beans, undoubtedly the best dish on the table. Frijoles are to the Mexican what pork and beans are to a Bostonian, macaroni to an Italian, salad to a Frenchman, and caviare to a Russian; but they are better than any of these other dishes, though they look somewhat like a purple-brown mess of oatmeal porridge. The whole thing wound up with puddings, pies, sweatmeats and coffee; cigarette smoking was freely indulged in by both ladies and gentlemen after each course; cigars were handed round at the conclusion of the repast. Such was the meal, with variations, which was served twice a day, and we were generally a dozen persons at table.

Music was the evening amusement, the usual one in Mexico, where a variety of stringed instruments are played—the Spanish guitar, the jarana a modification of it, the bandolon, a compound of guitar and banjo, and a small portable harp.

A tone of patriarchal simplicity in hacienda life is shown in the fact that the young lady of the family was addressed by all the dependents as Cholita, diminutive of her name Soledad.

The conditions of Mexican farming vary widely in different districts, and there are cotton, sugar, and coffee haciendas, each devoted to the culture of its particular staple.

On some of the large stock-farms the cattle roam at large like deer in a park, grouped into herds or families, with separate feeding grounds. Each of the *potreros*, or pastures, is under the charge of a *vaquero*, having under his care from 500 to 800 head of cattle, who know him, and come crowding round him in answer to his cry of *Toma! toma!* eager for the salt carried in a bag at his saddle-bow. When the capture of a bull has to be effected, several horsemen give chase together, turning and heading him off like greyhounds coursing a hare. When the moment comes for flinging the lasso (a long rope of leather or aloe-fibre fastened to the high pommel of the saddle), the dexterous *vaquero* sends it whizzing through the air, and its coil settles over the horns of the bull. The trained horse has then to play his part—planting his legs firmly on the ground, and throwing his weight against

the strain of the tightening rope, so as to bring the captive animal to a sudden check. Another form of capture, called *coleare*, requires still greater strength and skill, but is an every-day feat in Mexico. The rider, when sufficiently near, stoops from his horse, catches the bull's tail, and twists it between his own leg and the saddle, giving sufficient purchase to check or throw the animal with a jerk, causing doubtless an unpleasant shock to his nervous system.

The Mexican *vaquero* lives in the saddle, and is probably the most accomplished horseman in the world. If illiterate, as is frequently the case, he keeps count of his stock by a system of tallies on a broad strap of leather. Once every year all the cattle on the estate are driven into the corral, that they may be numbered and the young beasts branded. This muster, called the *herradero*, is a scene of great bustle and excitement, and is celebrated as the gala of the year with music and dancing.

Where the farmer or proprietor slaughters his own animals, the meat is usually preserved in the form called *sesina* or *tasajo*. Cut into strips several feet long by four fingers in breadth, it is left for one night wrapped in the fresh hide, after having been liberally sprinkled with salt and lemon-juice. Several days' exposure to the sun and air by hanging on lines, completes the process, after which it keeps perfectly. Though resembling old leather in appearance, it is savoury and easily cooked, requiring only to be broiled on the coals.

Milk does not count for much among the products of the *vaqueria*, and is generally the perquisite of the herdsmen. The calves are kept tied up in the corral for the first two months, in order to induce the mothers to come in twice a day and allow themselves to be milked, a process they will only submit to when their offspring have been first attended to. It is thus no uncommon thing on a Mexican grazing farm, where there are perhaps hundreds of cattle in the pastures, to be told that there is not a drop of milk to be had, as there is not a calf tied up.

Sheep in Mexico are of an inferior breed, and raised more for the sake of the flesh and tallow than of the wool, the production of which was discouraged by the commercial jealousy of the Spaniards.

On the arid table-lands of Chihuahua, Durango, and Zacatecas, horses are extensively bred; but here, where water is scarce, they have to be driven every day to the drinking-place, as they will not, like cattle, go in search of it for themselves. It is a striking sight to see them come galloping up, in the early morning, in droves or *atajos* of fifty or sixty, each consisting of animals of the same colour, under the escort of a leading horse, who wheels round and round his party to keep them together. One of the

dangers to which they are exposed in these regions is that of swallowing the *zataeco*, or grass-insect, called from *zacate* (grass), because indistinguishable from a green blade of some four inches long save when it is seen to move, and said to be fatal to a horse if taken into his stomach.

The *hacienda de beneficio* has no connection with any form of agriculture, but is devoted to the extraction of silver, on what is called the *patio* system. The ore, after being crushed in the mill, is spread, in the shape of puddle over a paved court to the depth of two or three feet. Sulphate of copper, in the proportion of one-half per cent., six per cent. of common salt, and 100 per cent. of quicksilver, being thrown in, the mass is trodden by a drove of horses for fourteen or twenty days. The precious metal is then separated by the action of water, from the clay and quicksilver, and the latter, purified by the application of heat, is available for use again. Silver is the chief product of Mexico, whose numerous mines have yielded half the quantity in use throughout the world.

The Mexican *ranch* (in Spanish, *cortijo*, in contradistinction to the *hacienda*), is the homestead of the smaller class of farmer, generally of semi-Indian extraction. The *ranchero* is a picturesque figure, always mounted and armed, clad in deerskin as to his nether extremities, while the invariable woollen blanket, the gaily-striped *serape* or more sober *manga*, is draped or rolled round his shoulders. His dwelling is little more than a shanty, built of *adobe* or sun-dried mud brick, in the higher elevations; but in the *Tierras Calientes*, constructed of bamboo staves, with a roof of reeds or grass sloping to the ground at the rear. The furniture is equally primitive. A bamboo bedstead or two in the sleeping-room, reed mats and skins thrown on the floor, and some calabashes and earthenware vessels, are the principal items of the inventory. A gun hanging on the wall, and agricultural implements few and simple, represent the industry of the males of the household; a bundle of rods for weaving, that of the females; and a clumsy guitar or bandolon, the accomplishments of the family. The larder is in the roof, as a safeguard against the depredations of white ants or similar marauders; and bunches of bananas, strings of jerked meat, and palm-leaf baskets containing beans, rice, eggs, and other provisions, are hung overhead. The hearth occupies the centre of the room, and near it are the never-failing *metate* and *metapilé*, a flat and round stone for bruising the maize in the process of *tortilla*-making, in which the women are engaged from early morning and at intervals all through the day. Thus the interior of the ranch presents an unvarying tableau of a group of buxom brown women, in coarse dark skirts and white smocks, kneeling on the ground, kneading, pounding,

and baking the yellow disks of Indian corn which constitute the principal food of the people.

For land in the Tierra Caliente, the ranchero will probably pay so much per head for his live stock, about two reals and upwards; and for every *cuartillo*, or five-acre plot of maize ground, a certain quantity of the produce, say, three *fanegas* (measure of 1½ imperial bushels). On small patches of cleared land he grows beans, Spanish pepper, tomatoes, sweet potatoes, arums (each plant producing ten and fifteen pounds of edible bulbs), and yams, which grow to a weight of forty or fifty pounds. The banana, however, is his staple. Fruitful from the second year of its growth, it produces, for half a century, 75 to 100 pods a year; and a few dozen plants requiring scarcely any culture, suffice to maintain a family. The problem of life is here reduced to its simplest elements, and can be solved with the minimum of labour. Tropical Nature is an over-indulgent parent, who spoils her offspring by excess of bounty, and life given thus gratis seems but a valueless boon.

The most characteristic form of culture practised in Mexico, is that of the maguey or aloe (*Agave Mexicana*), grown for the fermented liquor produced from it. This sour aloe-beer, called *pulque*, has been the national beverage since before the Conquest, and thirty million kilogrammes are annually consumed in the capital alone. Thither come every morning special *pulque* trains from the surrounding country, for the beverage does not keep and must be supplied fresh every day. The duty on it yields a revenue of a thousand dollars a day, and the railway companies pocket as much by way of freight. Notwithstanding these charges, it is sold at the rate of fifty quarts for a dollar, or eight cents a gallon, and it is calculated that the luxury of helpless inebriety may be enjoyed for twopence-halfpenny.

The *maguey* flourishes on rocky soil unfit for any other cultivation, and is of as hardy a constitution as its cast-iron aspect promises. A thousand plants are reckoned to the acre, and of these about five-and-twenty will be productive at any given time, as they take ten years to mature, and continue to yield sap for three months before they die. The skill of the *tlaquero*, the specialist in *maguey* culture, is shown in divining the right moment for excising the central spike, called *meyolote*, where the blossom is developing before it has opened completely. In eight days after this operation, the *cajete*, or cavity in the stump, fills with the sweet juice, called *agua miel*, and continues to yield a gallon a day for three months, or ninety gallons in all before its death. The chemistry by which this amazing quantity of fluid is extracted from the most parched soil, is one of the bewildering secrets of the laboratory of Nature.

The juice is drawn off by a singular process. To the plants fit for "milking," goes round the *tlachiquero*, a picturesque figure, with tattered sombrero, sandalled feet, and leathern apron. Inserting into the well of liquid a siphon, called *acajete*, or in Mexican *acocall* (water-throat), made of a large gourd tipped with a cow's horn, he sucks up into it the *agua miel* and pours it thence into the *corambes*, inflated sheepskins borne by an attendant donkey. Mr. Brocklehurst describes as follows, the remainder of the process:—

We proceeded from plant to plant, until the sheepskins on the donkeys' backs were filled; then we returned to the *tinacal*, or place where the "pulque" is made—a large fine barn, the earthen floor clean as the deck of a man-of-war. It was filled with square wooden frames, on which were stretched cow-hides, shaped like vats, the hairy side upwards. The liquid seemed to curdle in process of fermentation, and smelt very badly. The cowhides with their frames are called "tinas." The rotten curds are fed three times a day—in other words, after each milking—with *agua miel*. This ferments for about three hours, and from the "tina" is drawn into barrels for the pulquerias, or gaudily-adorned public-houses, where pulque is sold, and which are to be found at the corners of almost every street in Mexico. In many cases it is carried about the country in sheepskins, on the stalwart shoulders of peripatetic pedlars.

We entered the *tinacal* in a sort of procession, each one on entering exclaiming, "Alabo á Dios,"—"I praise God"—as he reverently removed his hat. The donkeys remained on the threshold, and the *agua miel* laden sheepskins were carefully brought in on the backs of Indians one by one. When the orifice of the sheepskin was opened, and the liquor ready for pouring out, the *tlachiquero*, or "boss" pulque maker of the *tinacal*, took the *meneador*, a long stake or switch from the corner, and making the sign of the Cross in the rotten curds, reverently exclaimed, "Ave Maria purisima," to which the Indian devoutly responded, "Alabado sea Dios y la Santisima Trinidad." Then the Indian proceeded to pour the contents of his sheepskin into a great vessel held over the "tina" by a man who cries, "Uno! dos! tres!" &c., as he turns the contents into the "tina."

Pulque, which is an opaline liquid like cocoa-nut milk, seems to foreign palates a most nauseous beverage, tasting like sour whey, with a strong flavour of decayed eggs, and a faint suggestion of putrid meat. It is said however to be a most wholesome drink, and the Indians are much addicted to its use and abuse. The intoxication produced by it, principally affects the legs and power of walking, leaving the head comparatively clear.

A more fiery intoxicant, called *mezcal*, is produced by a different process from a smaller-leaved aloe. The great *bourgeon*, or bud, somewhat like a head of cabbage, is cut out and roasted, and

a spirit distilled from the water in which it is then soaked. It is a very deleterious stimulant, and the usually pacific Indians become under its influence quarrelsome and violent.

Many of the products peculiar to Mexico require very tender nurture, and these are generally left to the patient-care of the natives. It is they who understand the treatment of the vanilla bean, the fruit of an orchis (*Epidendrum vanilla*), produced only in a district of a few square miles in the province of Vera Cruz, whence is exported the supply of the entire of Europe. The pods are gathered between March and June, and after gradually drying in the sun, or in cloudy weather before a slow fire, are packed with the utmost care, the presence of a single damaged pod sufficing to injure the contents of a whole chest.

Equal watchfulness is required in rearing the tiny insect which furnishes the cochineal of commerce, called in the native language *nochiztli* (cactus-blood). Principally produced in Chiapas and Oajaca, the annual export amounts to from a million to a million and a half pounds, value one-and-three-quarters to two million dollars. The cochineal insect (*coccus cacti*) lives on a species of nopal or cactus (*Cactus cochinchillifer*), whence its cultivators are called *nopaleros*. The plant, and with it the quality of the insect, is improved by cultivation, so that the *grana fina* and *grana sylvestra*, or tame and wild cochineal, are easily distinguishable. The former, which is much larger and dusted over with a mealy powder, is gathered only three times a year, the latter six times. The insect in all stages requires solicitous care, must be protected from extremes of heat and cold by screens to keep off sun and wind, and in some cases, where too much moisture is dreaded, is transported several days' journey, to await in a drier climate the passing of the rainy season. Fruit and blossoms are carefully removed from the plant, and its leaves so constantly cleansed that the dusky Indian women may be seen crouching under the cactuses for hours together, tenderly brushing and dusting them with a deer's or squirrel's tail. In addition a constant guard has to be kept against such enemies as birds and mice, lizards, spiders, wasps and bugs. The insects, which weigh about 70,000 to the pound, are laboriously gathered by women, who detach them from the plant with a blunt knife. They are enclosed in bags, killed by immersion in boiling-water, and after being dried in the sun are ready for the market.

The manioc (*Juca jatophha*) provides the Jarochos, or natives of the coast, with one of their principal articles of diet. The poisonous juice of its root being extracted, the grated fecula furnishes the cassava flour of which their bread is made. Another starchy substance, sago, is produced by a cuya growing on the edges of the chasms, from one to two thousand feet above

the level of the sea. It is a shrub some five or six feet high, with rigid leaves and stout stem, and the female plant bears a woody capsule containing some hundreds of fruits about the size of a walnut, filled with the pure farina, also found in the stem and root.

The Pharmacopeia derives two of its familiar remedies from Mexico—sarsaparilla, the root of a smilax, thriving in the damp and dark ravines, and jalap, the tuber of a convolvulus, so called from the town of Jalapa.

Cocoa-beans, used as a form of currency by the Aztecs, supplied them with their favourite beverage, chocolate flavoured with vanilla and spices. The tree flourishes best in Tabasco and Oajaca, the latter region producing the finest cocoa in the world. The natives have still such a preference for chocolate as a drink, that in Southern Mexico where coffee grows wild, they do not even care to gather it. It is however extensively cultivated for exportation, especially in the neighbourhood of Cordoba, and considerable quantities are shipped to France and the United States, made up in grass bales of from 200 to 220 lbs. Mr. Brocklehurst quotes the report of the Hon. J. W. Foster, late Minister to Mexico for the United States, in which he says that Mexico has the agricultural capacity to produce all the coffee that can be consumed in the United States of America, of a quality equal to the best berry of any country.

Tobacco of high quality is also largely grown, much of it being sent to Havana for the brand, and then sold as Cuban in the European markets.

Mexico, thus rich in all the most valuable agricultural products of the globe, is not less bountifully supplied with metallic treasures, from whose list, as Mr. Brocklehurst was informed by an expert, but one known mineral, cryolite, is absent. It is only human energy that is wanting to develop such varied forms of natural wealth, but without it they have all been lavished in vain.

In numbers alone the population is deficient. Ten millions of inhabitants, scattered over an area of 743,948 square miles, bear but the same proportion to it, as would 1,500,000 souls to that of the United Kingdom. But even these figures do not represent the sparseness of habitation over portions of this vast territory, extending 2,000 miles in one direction by 1,000 in another, and larger than France, Spain, the German Empire, and British Islands, taken collectively. The great cities absorb a disproportionately large number of the inhabitants, and after the capital, which ranks in this respect with Rome, come Leon, with 132,000 souls, larger than Antwerp or Genoa; San Luis Potosi, of about the size of Geneva; and Puebla and Guadalajara, on the

scale of Plymouth and Wolverhampton. The valley of Mexico is moreover a nucleus of population, whence it diminishes in density towards the outlying regions. Agriculturally therefore the country is but half developed, and would offer a promising field for immigration, were other conditions favourable.

On the accession of the first independent ruler, the Emperor Iturbide, Mexico ranked in point of size, as the third empire of the world, surpassed only by Russia and China. It is now the second Republic. With a political constitution modelled on that of its neighbour, it consists of twenty-seven States, the territory of Lower California, and the Federal District of Mexico, 461 square miles in extent. The actual President, General Manuel Gonzales, succeeded to power on the overthrow of his predecessor, General Porfirio Diaz, on December 1, 1880; but the arrangement come to since then, by which these two men are to rule alternately, will, it is hoped, give stability to the Government.

The House of Representatives numbers 227 members, one per 80,000 of population. Their qualifications are, attainment of the age of twenty-five, and eight years residence in the State. Elections by popular suffrage take place every two years. The constitution of 1824 abolished all distinctions of colour, but the natives are still socially if not legally oppressed.

The population of Mexico is, perhaps, the most motley in the world. "The blue blood of Castile" has, in the New World, run in very strange channels, and while the number of *Criollos* (Creoles), persons who claim to be of pure Spanish descent, is only 500,000, the Indians are 5,000,000, and the balance is made up of the mixed races styled "castes." Of these, the *Mestizoes*, forming the middle-class of the country and representing the fusion of Indian and Spanish blood, are the most numerous; but the introduction on the coast regions of the African element, has created there another hybrid race compounded of negro and Indian. The result is a droll mixture of the physical peculiarities of both, rendering these *zambos*, *lobos*, or *chinos* (curly-heads), as they are called indiscriminately, perhaps the ugliest type of humanity. The Indian women it is said prefer to mate with negroes, rather than with their own countrymen, as the joyous vivacity of the African forms an attractive contrast to their own melancholy temperament. The negro race cannot subsist on the plateaus, and the 10,000 mulattoes, reckoned by Humboldt among the population of the capital, have completely disappeared.

Spaniards, of European birth, are called *Gachupinos*, a corruption of an Aztec word, compounded of *cactli* and *chopina*, meaning "prickle-shoes." The spurs of those formidable Spanish cavaliers, the terror of whose strange aspect was such an element

in the subjugation of the country, are thus commemorated in popular parlance.

The Indians, so far from being a homogeneous race, are divided into thirty-five tribes, speaking 140 dialects, and comprising some strange varieties of the human species. Among these are the Pintos, a race of piebald men, spotted like hounds or cattle, with large slate-coloured blotches on a dun, tawny skin. They inhabit the tangled forests adjoining the Zacatula River on the Pacific slope.

The *Indios mansos*, or "tame Indians," so called in contradistinction to their unreclaimed brethren the *Indios bravos*, live everywhere apart from their conquerors. In the cities they occupy separate suburbs, and in the country form native villages, *pueblos*, or *pueblitos*, governed by their own customs, and ruled by certain aristocratic families of hereditary position. Their social system is communistic, all lands being held in common and only a house-place and garden owned as private property. Even the personal liberty of the individual, and to some extent his labour, are at the disposal of the community. Thus residence within its precincts is compulsory, and those who cultivate distant farms are expected to return after the harvest, or in any case, to appear at certain festivals. Contracts are entered into by employers of labour with the alcaldes of the villages for a certain number of hands, and as payment is made in advance, the community is then bound to supply them. The peons on the great estates are practically enslaved by debt to the employer, and have generally mortgaged the labour of their descendants as well as their own.

Herr Ratzel describes the working of the internal economy of the village system at Pueblo Nuevo, near Acapulco, where he stopped on his ride from the Pacific to the interior. At six in the morning, a large drum, hung from a tree in the market-place, was sounded, to summon the male population, 150 strong, to assist in weeding the space round the church. The work, suspended after three hours, was resumed again at three in the afternoon, and continued till six, when it was followed by the rehearsal of an auto or sacred drama, for performance at a coming feast. The piece, in the style of a monotonous ballet, turned on a battle between Moors and Christians, and was accompanied by the music of violins, flutes, and drums.

The Indians are very skilful gardeners, and understand the culture and use of many plants unknown to the Creoles; but each family only grows sufficient for its own consumption. They also collect the products of the forest, such as gums and plant-fibres, those of the bromelia and agave—*pita* and *iztli*—being used for making coarse cloths. They show considerable

artistic perception in modelling figures illustrative of national costumes, in wax, terra-cotta, and even rags, and have an instinct for manufacturing musical instruments, guitars, and violins, of good tone, though clumsy construction.

As porters and messengers they perform wonderful feats, carrying enormous weights by a strap passed across the forehead; and it is on record that one of them could carry 600 lbs. of sand-stone a considerable distance. Those who in former times sent them with letters or light commissions, generally made them up with some pounds' weight of stones, to ensure their not being forgotten. The couriers of Montezuma travelled so expeditiously that, by a system of relays, he was able to have the fish taken in the Gulf of Mexico served on his table at a distance of 270 miles, within twenty-four hours.

Suspicious in his dealings with white men, the Indian is generally indirect and ambiguous in his mode of expression. This timorousness is exemplified by Humboldt's description of the native system of trading with the Spanish outposts along the road to Santa Fé, by attaching their goods, buffalo robes, furs, &c., to small crosses along the wayside, while the articles given in exchange by the soldiers—provisions, salt, or tobacco—were deposited in the same place.

The Mexican aborigines approach to the Mongol type, and appear to be of a different race from the nomad Indians, who are perhaps allied to the Patagonians. They are physically inferior to the hunting tribes, and the men are universally ugly. The women, when young, are not devoid of a certain plump comeliness, and show some taste in decorating their persons. An Indian maiden, with the white blossoms of the *blumeria*, her favourite flower, in her dark hair, is not an unattractive object. Their dress consists, like that of the *poblanas* of Mexico, of a dark skirt and white upper garment. Men and women wear the same out-door wrap—a coarse mantle, *huipile*, with openings for the head and arms. Among the physical peculiarities which distinguish them from Europeans, are the greater thickness of the skin, and the characteristic gait—a sort of shuffling trot in both sexes alike.

Though infant mortality is very high among them—probably owing to injudicious food—the adults are healthy, and extreme longevity is common. Wounds are healed rapidly and easily, and even intemperance entails no penalty, as they are exempt from *delirium tremens*. They are never attacked by yellow fever, but are carried off wholesale by small-pox, as well as by the *matlazahuatl*—a sort of virulent typhus peculiar to themselves. Of this epidemic 800,000 are believed to have perished in 1545, and 2,000,000 in 1576, while a more recent outbreak depopu-

lated whole districts, where ruined villages tell the tale of its ravages.

The form of salutation on entering an Indian dwelling is, "Ave Maria," and the answer, "En gracia concebida." The men usually speak a little Spanish, the women and children only their own dialect. In the Aztec language the substantives are mostly compounded of descriptive epithets, doubtless owing to the system of writing, which required visible symbols for all ideas. The felicity of some of these combined phrases is inspired by the intuitive poetry of primitive speech. Thus: a lake is *atezcatl*, water mirror; an armadillo, *ayotochili*, tortoise-rabbit; and the ships of the Spaniards were termed water-houses. The words *chocalatl*, *tomatl*, *ocelotl*, *copalli*, have been adopted almost unchanged from the Aztec into the European languages; and the Mexican *zicalli*, a small calabash for chocolate, appears in the Spanish as *jicara*, and in the Italian as *chicchera*, meaning a tiny cup in both cases.

The Spanish conquest was regarded by the Indians as the final defeat of their gods, no less than of their temporal rulers. An instance of their moral subjugation was afforded on the march of Cortes to Yucatan, when one of his horses being invalidated and left in charge of the inhabitants of the Isles of Peten, was treated by them with such reverential ceremony as proved fatal to it. Flowers and spiced meats were the only offerings held worthy of its dignity, and the result, as might be imagined, was its death. Its effigy in stone was then placed in the principal *teocalli*, where the Franciscan missionaries, in 1618, found it worshipped as the god of thunder and lightning.

In such a frame of mind towards their conquerors, the Indians were readily converted to the victorious faith, and were baptized by millions. Within forty years 600 bishoprics and 6,000 monasteries were established, carrying civilization and enlightenment into the most remote regions, while the priests were everywhere the champions of the enslaved race. The names of Father Olmedo, the chaplain of Cortes, unwearying in his efforts to check the conqueror's fanaticism, and of the heroic Las Casas, who twelve times crossed the ocean to plead the cause of the oppressed natives, must ever be dear to the friends of humanity.

The priests of the native villages at the present day are for the most part Indians themselves. Preferring a spiritual teacher of their own race, the flocks choose one amongst them for the ecclesiastical career, and have him trained accordingly. In place of church dues, the community provides the priest with the requisite service for his household wants.

The Church, ever flexible in secondary matters, adapts itself as far as possible to the habits of the people. Thus, as Sunday is

commonly their market-day, an open-air Mass is said on the church steps, at which vendors and customers assist from their places in the square. The custom has doubtless given rise to the statement, current among Protestant writers, that the Indians are dispensed from hearing Mass on Sunday.

Some of their ancient observances are sanctioned by being associated with Christian worship, and the *mitate*, a native dance, is still performed in honour of Our Lady of Guadalupe, whose apparition to a poor Indian shepherd was accepted by the race as a visible sign of her adoption of them. A pretty native custom is that of associating the wild denizens of the forest with the procession of Corpus Christi, by capturing and tying them up along its route. A singular observance is that of offering banquets to the dead, on the Eve and Feast of All Souls. On the Vigil it is the departed children of the household who are invited to partake of sweets and dainties laid on dishes decorated with roses, marigolds, and daturas, while more substantial food is prepared for the adult dead on the following day. The smoke of incense, used in all the Aztec celebrations, fills the house during these two days, and it is thronged with visitors and friends.

Some reminiscences of Paganism still crop up occasionally, and two Aztec idols, disinterred not long ago in the capital, are said to have been crowned with flowers during the night. The gigantic cypress, the most venerable of those that shaded the favourite country palace of Montezuma on the wooded bluff of Chapultepec, is draped with fluttering rags, a practice inherited from some primitive form of worship, still prevailing in fragmentary survival, from Ireland to the frozen deserts of Siberia. In some remote parts of New Mexico,\* the return of the white god Quetzalcoatl is still looked for by the natives, and the sacred fire is kept alight in a cavern of the mountains, as it was on the four hundred altar towers of Cholula, the Holy City of Anahuac, until Cortes quenched its rays in the blood of its votaries.

Though the Indians are the most numerous of all sections of the Mexican population, they are without political influence, and it is on the *Mestizoes*, the Indo-Spanish half-castes—said to combine the worst qualities of both parent races—that the future of Mexico depends. As domestic servants, traders, farmers, and artisans, they furnish the active element of society, and practically constitute the Mexican nation. Turbulent and unruly, they have been the source of the past disorders of the country, as they are the most formidable menace to its present prosperity.

Mr. Brocklehurst has on his title-page styled Mexico, “a Country with a Great Future,” and shows plausible grounds for

---

\* Now annexed to the United States.

the prognostication. He has however omitted from his consideration some of the causes likely to delay its fulfilment. For it is no doubt true that Mexico has a future to look forward to, but it will be for Mexico without the Mexicans. The effete Spaniard, the unstable Mestizo, the apathetic Indian must disappear, and the speculative but methodical, the shrewd but adventurous, Anglo-Saxon of the West must take their place, ere this great, waste, luxuriant, dilapidated playground of tropical Nature become the orderly and bounteous harvest-field of humanity. For a country may be redeemed from the depths of degradation, but a race never.

Instability of institutions, the Nemesis of modern democracy, has been the curse of Mexico. Its Government, until recently probably the worst in the world, combined all the evils of savagery and civilization. Impotent to repress disorder, as the most impotent of barbarous States, it was on a level with the most advanced in the refinements of civil corruption, and its society was at once dissolved in anarchy and devoured by officialism. Justice was so venal as to create a trade in its unrighteousness, carried on by speculators, who bought up desperate cases in order to prosecute them by bribery. Public honesty was at so low an ebb, that a bargain with the revenue officers was the recognized mode of passing goods through the custom-house at Vera Cruz. Public safety was so idle a phrase, that the diligence was daily robbed at the gates of the capital, and its passengers murdered if they attempted self-defence. In Mexico alone, of all countries in the world, the terrors of peace surpassed those of war, for while during war the brigands were at least enrolled in the army, during peace the army recruited the ranks of the brigands. And such was the character of that army, even when under nominal discipline, that travellers if offered an escort, were often in doubt whether it might not be better to trust to the mercies of their plunderers rather than of their protectors. Revolutions meantime were so frequent, that the average duration of a Presidency, nominally a term of four years, was, during an entire decade, but eight months. Amid the general shipwreck of society, the Church, unchangeable, and therefore obnoxious to innovators, austere in doctrine, and consequently odious to the violent and the vicious, above all wealthy, and therefore a tempting object of plunder to the rapacious, was soon singled out for attack. Secret societies moreover, the plague of continental Europe, and everywhere the implacable foes of religion, had taken root in the New World, and among the many civil convulsions witnessed by the city of Mexico, a sanguinary feud between two rival Masonic Lodges had been one.\*

---

\* The Masonic propaganda in the New World is so active, that in a

A very large amount of property, calculated at three-quarters of the available land and houses in Mexico had accumulated in the possession of ecclesiastical bodies; such easy landlords, that their tenants were said to sublet in some cases for ten times the amount paid as head rent. The injury inflicted on the community was thus scarcely appreciable, and more than compensated even from a commercial point of view, by the services rendered. By a decree of President Comonfort, on June 25, 1856, all Church property was converted into a mortgage, the rental, reckoned at six per cent., being taken as the standard of valuation, and the tenant becoming sole owner on payment of the capitalized sum. Thus a rental of sixty dollars was redeemable at a thousand.

Three years later President Benito Juarez, a full-caste Indian, passed a still more sweeping decree, enforcing the absolute confiscation of all Church property, the suppression of the religious Orders, the prohibition of the ecclesiastical garb, and the total separation of Church and State. This drastic measure was put in immediate operation; but, by the mysterious fatality which seems to attend similar legislation, the Mexican Government, after its boa-constrictor gorge of confiscation, continued as needy and hungry as before, and showed no more signs of improved condition than did Pharaoh's lean kine, after having made a meal on their fat sisters.

Yet Brutus is an honourable man, and President Juarez was generally credited with personal honesty. But since to this epoch can be traced the sudden acquisition of large fortunes by many of the revolutionary leaders, it is difficult to acquit him of connivance at public plunder on a gigantic scale even if his own hands remained clean.

So rabid was his zeal for persecution, that he assisted personally at the destruction of the churches in Mexico, and the eagerness with which the work was carried on under his auspices caused an unhappy accident—the death of several of the workmen engaged in the demolition of the church and convent of S. Francis. The triumph of the anti-clerical party was complete, and Mr. Bullock\* found but one church available for public worship in Vera Cruz in 1860, the others being converted into warehouses, where bales of merchandise were piled on the altars. The same traveller, on his journey inland, saw church-bells thrown to rust by the wayside, the Liberals having, as they phrased it, “cut

---

letter from a missionary in Ontario, in a recent number of *Les Missions Catholiques* (May 25, 1883), it is stated that each lodge is bound to send at least two colonists every year to Manitoba or some of the North-Western States, paying all their expenses, and establishing them as missionaries in the newly opened regions.

\* “Across Mexico.” By W. H. Bullock. Cambridge. 1866.

the tongues out of the churches," in gratuitous malevolence. One of the churches in Mexico served as a *café*, the others for various secular purposes.

When, on April 10, 1864, a Catholic Prince of the House of Hapsburg accepted the throne of Mexico, though only as the crowned pawn of Napoleon, the Conservative party hoped for a change of policy. Maximilian made a special journey to Rome to receive the benediction of the Pope before his departure, but had scarcely reached his new dominions when counter influences began to act upon his mind. As early as October 19, of the year of his accession, Pius IX. addressed a letter of remonstrance to him on the delay in revoking the decrees of his predecessor. No steps were taken in that direction, and despite the arrival of a Papal Nuncio, the Emperor, finding the Holy See had authorized no compromise, issued a decree confirming the sequestration of the Church property. So far indeed did he lean at this time towards the anti-clerical party that he authorized the continuous working of Government offices during Sundays and holidays. He thus alienated the Conservative party without conciliating their opponents, and on the withdrawal of the French forces, had no substantial following in the country.

His last State banquet at Chapultepec, on the fatal march from Orizava to Querétaro, was commonly styled by the Juarists, his "Belshazzar's Feast," and the Mene, Thekel, Phares of mysterious warning might have been addressed to him who, like the Assyrian, was "weighed in the balance and found wanting." Swift and terrible was the retribution for errors that sprang from negative rather than positive defects of character, for failings that would have been venial in a less difficult position. And the tragedy of that June morning at the Cerro de las Campanas, has effaced from the public mind all feeling save that of tender and regretful pity for the chivalrous and amiable prince so hardly placed and so cruelly ended.

The death of Maximilian (June 19, 1867) is the last dramatic episode of Mexican history, and since then its obscure miseries have been unregarded by the world. Now it is beginning to attract attention as a profitable field for the investment of capital, and an effort is being made towards its political rehabilitation. *Pronunciamientos*, we are told, are a thing of the past; an orderly régime has been established by the agreement between Generals Gonzales and Diaz, and the Mexicans have embodied the wisdom of bitter experience in the proverb that, "a bad government is better than a good revolution." The revenue has increased from 18,000,000 dollars in 1879 to an anticipated 35,000,000 dollars for the current year, 1883, and the prodigal of nations gives earnest of sincerity in repentance, by

paying its debts before settling down as a respectable member of society. At a meeting of the Mexican Bondholders' Committee, held in London, May 18, 1883, it was decided to accept the terms offered in settlement of their long outstanding claims, and the resumption of diplomatic intercourse between England and Mexico followed immediately.

Two-thirds of the trade of Mexico, the aggregate of which is £12,000,000 yearly, is carried on with the United States, the principal exports being silver and other minerals; the imports, cotton and linen manufactures, wrought iron and machinery. From Great Britain similar goods are imported to the value of over a million and a half, while the exports of Mexico to the British markets are inconsiderable, averaging only £600,000, of which £80,000 are for silver ore.

With extended facilities for transport throughout the country a very large increase in its trade might be looked for, and to this end English and American enterprise are now actively directed. Mexico had, in 1882, 2,235 miles of railway open, a very small fraction, however, of the undertakings projected. The configuration of the country presents the most formidable engineering difficulties, wonderfully surmounted in the line from Vera Cruz to the capital, opened by an English company on January 1, 1873. This road, the construction of which, carried on during thirty-six years under forty Presidents and an Emperor, cost £8,000,000, or an average of £30,000 a mile, is, Mr. Brocklehurst tells us, "a very marvel of engineering, and of the 7,600 feet of ascent, 4,000 are done in 25 miles. The road spans ravines, scales precipices, gets higher and higher by loops, plunges through the heart of the mountain, and then up it goes into the cloudland, and in the teeth of almost insurmountable difficulties, passes into a lonely plain, and winds into the capital, near the celebrated shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe." This costly line is the principal one owned by the Mexican Railway Company, whose report published in London on May 19, 1883, declared a dividend at the rate of 15 per cent. per annum. Such prosperity, however, can scarcely be more than temporary, as the normal trade of the country is not sufficient to maintain it, and it is partly accounted for by the transport of material for other railways.

These competing lines are principally of American ownership, and form part of a vast scheme, not only for connecting Mexico with the railway system of the United States, bringing its capital within five days' train of New York, but also for running two great trunk lines down the eastern and western South American sea-boards, to terminate in Patagonia.

The Mexican Government admits all railway plant free of

duty, and grants a subsidy of from 7,000 to 9,000 dollars for every kilomètre of road completed.

A picturesque incident of railway construction is the *conducta*, or treasure cavalcade, which starts from Mexico every Saturday to pay the wages of the labourers along the lines in process of formation. An escort of forty or fifty picked men of the Rural Guard, riding like Centaurs and got up like Cavaliers at a fancy ball, lead the van, the treasure mules, heavily laden with silver dollars, occupy the centre, and the rear is brought up by a retinue of *mozos*, or native servants, mounted and armed to the teeth.

But these precautions, however effective as a pictorial addition to the landscape, savour too much of actual warfare for the practical eye of the capitalist, and recall the dark shadow on Mexican prosperity. Save in the immediate neighbourhood of the capital, there is no security for life or property, and the *Times*, writing on April 3, 1883, speaks of it as unsafe to visit the scene of Maximilian's death, close to Queretaro, a town of 40,000 inhabitants.

The Apache border is as disturbed as ever, and from that quarter comes news of a terrible raid during the same month of April, and the massacre of ninety-three settlers in the neighbourhood of Hermosilla. This northern frontier of Mexico is the scene of that terrible war of extermination between the red man and the white, which has furnished romance with so many thrilling incidents.\* Along the Indian march, the Spaniards established a chain of outposts called *presidios*, to check the incursions of their fierce neighbours, and by the grant of lands to the soldiers and their families, sought to give stability to the system of military colonization. The history of these settlements, were it ever written, would be a fearful record of mutual reprisals, in which the red man would often be outdone in savagery by the white.

The celebrated raid of Don Santiago Kirker, whose name deserves to be gibbeted in history, may serve as a specimen of the amenities of border warfare. The people of Chihuahua, much harassed by the Indians, having offered a reward of fifty dollars a scalp for their extermination, Kirker, an Irishman resident in Mexico, collected a band of desperadoes, and in August, 1846, surprised a party of Apaches engaged in trading at a neighbouring village during a time of temporary truce. Men, women, and children, to the number of a hundred and sixty were ruthlessly massacred, and their scalps brought in to decorate the

\* Some of the most vivid descriptions of Mexican life and scenery are to be found in Captain Mayne Reid's novels of guerilla warfare, "The Scalp Hunters" and "The Rifle Rangers."

gates of Chihuahua, where they were seen still suspended in the following November, by Mr. Ruxton, an English traveller. Even an infant which saw the light in that hour of terror, was murdered under circumstances of peculiar atrocity, but with a hideous parody of piety, was baptized in the church where its mother had taken refuge, as a preliminary to having its brains dashed out against the wall.

Though nearly half a century has elapsed since this infamy was perpetrated, the conditions under which the war of race is carried on have changed little in the interval, and an advance in the price of scalps is the only homage rendered to increasing civilization. The *New York Tribune*, as recently as May, 1883, published the following account of a raid from the same city which sent forth Kirker and his gang :—

Thirty mounted men left the city to hunt Indians. They scalped eight whom they caught unarmed, and captured a number of squaws and ponies. They then turned homeward, and reached Chihuahua on Sunday, were publicly received on the plaza of the city by the mayor, as though they were heroes returning from a glorious war. The whole city turned out to greet them, and amid the clanging of the cathedral bells, and the voices of the populace, they rode through the streets, decked with bunting, with eight bloody scalps dangling from a pole carried by eight men. Many of the poor squaws carried their infants on their backs, and men who called themselves brave, showed their superior manhood by striking these wretched barbarian mothers and their infants, as they trod their weary way in the procession. The squaws thus captured are imprisoned for life, and the Government pays 200 dols. for every Indian scalp presented to it.

The Indians here spoken of are Apaches, a nation numbering nine tribes, and roughly estimated at 30,000 strong. They are a cowardly and treacherous race, preferring strategy to force, and after their forays are generally ready to sue for peace, which of course is only binding during their pleasure.

The Comanches, who come from beyond the Rio Pecos and the Del Norte, practise more warlike tactics. They form a regular army of invasion, entering the country in three divisions, one of them taking the way of the dreaded Mapimi desert, the great thirst country of Mexico, a four days' march without food or water, on which many of their animals perish. For these they quickly find compensation on the rich haciendas, upon which they descend in a destroying horde, carrying fire and sword to the very foot of the Sierra Madre, and retiring laden with plunder. In 1846 they thus overran all Durango and Chihuahua, completely cutting off these outlying States, and after defeating the troops sent against them in two pitched battles, retreated in

triumph, carrying off over 10,000 mules and horses. So regularly are these expeditions timed, that September, the month in which they take place, is called by the tribe "the Mexico moon," as the other months are called the "buffalo," or "beaver moons," from the game then in season.

It will be seen that settlers need not look to find a smiling Eden of the West in this red border land, where life is cheap if land is plenty, and rifle and revolver are as necessary adjuncts of agriculture as hoe and mattock. Indeed, the wonder is, under such conditions, not that the country is thinly peopled, but that it should not be absolutely uninhabited. A few years it is true may make a great change in the present aspect of things. The steam-engine, that panacea of modern social philosophy, will carry culture into the desert, and bring peace upon the war-path; and all the plumed and painted chivalry of the prairie—Comanche and Navajo, and Maricoco and Apache, will vanish, as Huron and Iroquois, and Delaware and Mohawk have vanished, before the iron spells of civilization. But that time has not yet come, and the Red Man, the embodied vengeance of a disinherited race, the haunting menace of the frontier, the shadow on the settler's ranch, the spectre of the planter's hearth, must still be reckoned with as a factor in the future of Mexico.

E. M. CLERKE.

---

ART. III.—SOME NEW ENGLISH DOCUMENTS ON  
OUR LADY'S IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

1. *Life, Letters and Sermons of Herbert de Losinga* (1050–1119). Edited by DEAN GOULBURN and H. SYMONDS. Two vols. Parker: 1878.
2. *Legenda Sanctorum*.—The Proper Lessons for Saints' Days, according to the Use of Exeter, compiled by JOHN DE GRANDISSON, Bishop, 1327. Edited by HERBERT EDWARD REYNOLDS, M.A., Priest-Vicar and Librarian of Exeter Cathedral. London: Elliot Stock, 1880–1883. Fasciculi I. II. III.

THIS is an age of disinterment. But while there are body-snatchers who rifle the tombs of the dead for subjects for the dissecting-room, there are those also who reverently unwrap the shroud and gather up sacred bones that they may place them in a more honourable shrine. We have two such enshrinements before us; one is of the remains of Herbert de Losinga, first Bishop of Norwich, the other of those of John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter.

Of the publication of the letters and sermons of Herbert we should like to speak well, for never probably have more pains been given to editing an ancient author. Indeed these are out of all proportion with their subject. Herbert was a great bishop, but not a great writer; and no one would be more surprised than himself to see his few letters and sermons become the text for innumerable notes and dissertations. Of these, too, a large proportion are in no way elucidations, but are either hostile or quite beside the subject. The bones of this mediæval bishop have not been set by Dean Goulburn and Canon Symonds in gold and gems and carefully arranged for the veneration of his clients; but are stuck all round the shrine like pegs on which to hang the thirty-nine articles of Anglican theology, and innumerable scraps of the tinsel erudition and fantastic speculations of the editors. One small volume would have well sufficed to contain the text of Herbert's remains, together with an introduction and life and the necessary notes. Instead of this we have two large volumes in which the text of the Catholic Bishop of Norwich meanders at the top of the pages through fields of Protestant notes and dissertations.

Very different is the treatment of Bishop John de Grandisson. The librarian of Exeter cathedral, Mr. Herbert Reynolds, is doing a good work well. He has had the fine instinct to recognize the value of the treasures in his custody, and the talent and enterprise necessary to make them known and appreciated by others. He is carrying on simultaneously the publication of two important works, both involving great labour as well as pecuniary risk. One of these is the "Ordinale" of the Church of Exeter, by which is to be understood not that part of the Pontifical relating to Holy Orders, but the Directory, or Consuetudinary, giving detailed rules for the conduct of Divine Service throughout the year. Of this one part is already issued, and it will be completed in two more. We do not purpose to speak at present of this publication. We must wait till it is complete, and it must then be taken in connection with the *Consuetudinarium* of St. Osmund, or of Sarum, just edited by Canon Jones for the Master of the Rolls.\* Mr. Reynolds has not the advantage of Government aid in his work, yet he is carrying it out in a far more luxurious style, and the issue will be limited to three hundred copies, of which we trust that several will find their place in our Catholic libraries. The Preface will contain information drawn from hitherto untouched documents.

As regards the *Legenda Sanctorum*, it will be completed in

\* Canon Jones has printed the Sarum *Consuetudinarium* in Latin, and furnished an excellent translation and introduction. This directory forms the first and principal part of the Register of St. Osmund, the second volume of which is already in the press.

seven or eight fasciculi, of which three are already published. Each number will contain elucidative and historical matter, and will be illustrated with facsimiles of the text or of illuminations and frescoes. Thus the half-obliterated mural painting of the Assumption, executed in the fourteenth century, and still to be seen on the right-hand side of the entrance to the Lady Chapel of Exeter Cathedral, will be reproduced with the lessons of the Assumption. The two splendid volumes of the Exeter Lectionary have an autographic entry of Bishop Grandisson, stating that they are his gift to his cathedral church, made on Lady-day, 1366, in the thirty-ninth year of his episcopacy, and they are "according to his arrangement and abbreviation." The title-page gives the contents, as follows :—

The first part contains whatever is read from the Bible. In this portions of the Bible are omitted, but no change is made in the text, and since the whole cannot be read, those parts at least are read which correspond to the season. The second part contains sermons and homilies belonging to the tempore, with the lessons of St. Mary, and of the dedication of the church and its octave, &c. The third part in another volume contains the proper lessons of the Saints who are honoured in the use of Exeter, with the common of the Saints, and the lessons for the commemorations of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and the legends of certain Saints commemorated in the Church of Exeter only.

Of these two volumes Mr. Reynolds is publishing the second, containing the lessons for saints' days, as well as the special lessons for the offices of our Blessed Lady. In a preface of fifteen quarto pages he has given a not very methodical, yet interesting and instructive, account of the Divine Office and its Lectionary, of the "Use" of Exeter, and of the revision made by Bishop Grandisson. The first fasciculus is a reproduction of the original, with its abbreviations and punctuation; in the other numbers the Latin text is given *in extenso*, as in similar publications of the Rolls Series. While, therefore, enough has already appeared to prove that the publication is in competent hands, and to warrant us in earnestly recommending this work to the support of English Catholics, we must await its completion before we can compare the lessons of the Church of Exeter with those of other churches or with those of our present breviaries.

We have brought together the two publications we have been describing for a common purpose. They both serve to illustrate the tradition of the English Church with regard to our Lady's Immaculate Conception.

To return, then, to the writings of the Bishop of Norwich. The sermons, which, with the translation and the editors' notes, make up the second volume, are fourteen in number. The MS. from which

they are printed formerly belonged to the cathedral church of Norwich, and is now in the library of the University of Cambridge. The sermons are good, but not of remarkable excellence. They present the ordinary characteristics of the eleventh and twelfth century sermons that have come down to us in the Latin language. They are full of Scripture, often interpreted in an allegorical sense. They are for the most part dogmatic, and such exhortations as they contain are introduced abruptly, and without much appropriateness, at the end ; indeed, these are of such a nature that it is hard to say to what class of persons the sermons were addressed. They seem in general more suited to the clergy or to monks than to the laity ; yet an admonition like the following, which occurs in the sermon for Christmas, can hardly have been addressed to monks : "Flee therefore murder, sacrilege, theft, false witness. Abound in works of mercy ; find opportunity for almsgiving." Or, again, in the sermon for All Saints' : "Do penance ; make confessions ; empty your hearts of the venom of wickedness. Flee from gluttony, drunkenness, fornication. Fill not your houses with the spoils of them that mourn, nor your coffers with robbery and extortion. . . . Death knocks at the door of your castles, and do you fill them with riches?" If the sermons were not spoken *ad clerum* they would not be spoken in Latin, as we now have them, and the moralities may in the vernacular have taken a more developed and persuasive form. In penning them for the learned more attention would be paid to the dogmatic part, and the exhortations would be considerably abridged.

The most interesting thing in these sermons is that Herbert gives explicit testimony to our Lady's Immaculate Conception. The words occur in the sermon on the Assumption, and as they have never found a place in the catena of authorities for our Lady's privilege, deserve to be given verbatim : "Fuit beatissima virgo Maria de genere Abrahæ et tribu Juda, de radice Jesse, filia David ; ingenua de ingenuis, et cui nulla de propagine macula inhesisset. Joachim pater, Anna mater, uterque sterilis ; sed per virtutem Sancti Spiritus et per annuntiationem Gabrielis fœcunditatem meruerunt." The allusion to the action of the Holy Ghost probably explains an expression in another sermon, which the editors take to be an explicit denial of the Immaculate Conception, and, indeed, of our Lady's actual sinlessness. In the Christmas sermon are the following words : "Accedit ad uterum virginis Spiritus Sanctus, purgat originali et actuali culpa quam sua impleturus erat gratia. Clamat angelus : Ne timeas Maria. Ecce concipies, &c." The editors remark, in their note : "Bishop Herbert holds that she was purged both of original and actual sin at the moment when by the Holy Ghost she conceived our

Lord." The words certainly give this impression at the first reading, yet Herbert can scarcely have meant this, for he would explicitly contradict himself. In the words quoted from the sermon on the Assumption he affirms the Immaculate Conception, and this the editors do not deny. Moreover, such an interpretation would compel us to hold that an English bishop, a contemporary of St. Anselm's, a Benedictine monk and a learned man, publicly taught that the Blessed Mother of God had been even guilty of actual sins. Now no one will be surprised to find Anglican clergymen saying, as the editors do in this very note, "that the Holy Spirit did indeed purge the Lord's human nature in the womb, which needed such purgation, as being taken from a sinner." Such language befits Anglican theology. But it would require strong and irrefragable proof to convince us that one of the assistants at the consecration of St. Anselm denied the sinlessness of Mary. "It was fitting," wrote St. Anselm, "that that Virgin should be resplendent with such a purity that, under God, a greater could not be imagined."\* And in perfect harmony with this great maxim Herbert writes, in his sermon on the Assumption:—

She was made white with many virtues and merits, yea, whiter than the driven snow was she made by the gift of the Holy Ghost; and showed forth in all things the simplicity of the dove, since whatever was done in her was all purity and simplicity, was all pure grace, was all the mercy and justice which looked down from heaven. And therefore is she called undefiled, because in nothing was she corrupt.

How then can we interpret Herbert so as to leave him in harmony with himself and with the universal theology of his time? His words may, perhaps, be understood to mean that the purifying operation of the Holy Ghost took place, not at the moment of our Lord's Incarnation, but at the moment of our Lady's own conception, so that He purified her from sin original and actual, which would have found place in her but for His preventing grace. This interpretation is in harmony with His own words about her parents; for in saying that the Holy Ghost gave them miraculous fecundity, and in the same breath asserting that "no stain clung to her from her origin (*de propagine*), Herbert evidently attributes a double work to the Holy Ghost, the gift of fruitfulness to her parents and of sinlessness to Mary. Nor does this interpretation do violence to the context in the Christmas sermon, since the Bishop is not there giving a detailed history of the Annunciation, but in very rapid words stating what was done before our Lord's birth. "Ye are sitting down at the board of the Almighty King, give diligent heed to the things that are set

---

\* "De Con. Virg." c. 18, Op. t. i. p. 152. Ed. Gerberon.

before you. There is set before you the conception by a virgin, the delivery of a virgin. The Holy Ghost cometh upon the Virgin, and purgeth from sin, original and actual, her whom he would fill with His grace (*quam sua impleturus erat gratia*). The angel cries : Fear not, Mary, etc." Certainly if Herbert here speaks of that descent of the Holy Ghost of which Gabriel spoke—*Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te*—then the interpretation here proposed cannot be accepted. But why should he be supposed to allude to this and not to that former operation in our Lady's soul in the first moment of its creation ? The operation or descent of the Holy Ghost is supposed to precede the message of the angel. " Accedit ad uterum virginis Spiritus Sanctus, purgat originali et actuali culpa quam sua impleturus erat gratia ;" and after this, " Clamat angelus : Ne timeas Maria." Herbert may then be well taken to mean that the Holy Ghost, having chosen from all eternity this Blessed Virgin, prepares from the beginning a worthy dwelling-place for the Son of God in her, whom, *at a future day*, He would fill with His grace—*i.e.*, the graces which accomplished and accompanied her maternity. That Herbert should say "uterum," and not "animam virginis," is no difficulty, since the Immaculate Conception was given in view of the maternity. "Deus qui per Immaculatam Virginis Conceptionem dignum Filio tuo habitaculum præparasti" are the words of the Church's prayer.

Another consideration which makes this interpretation of Herbert's words still more probable, is that, if the word *purgat* is to be taken literally as cleansing from sin or guilt, then the bishop must be supposed to teach that before the moment of the Incarnation not only did there remain some guilt of actual venial sins in the soul of our Lady, but also the guilt of original sin, which is mortal, and deprives the soul of all habitual grace. Protestants may understand the matter differently, and confound original sin with concupiscence. But this was not Herbert's view. In his Easter sermon he explains how he understood original sin : " Ira Dei per protoplastum peccatorem in omnes homines transierat ;" and then, after saying that the death of our Lord on the Cross expiated our spiritual death and brought pardon for original sin, he adds : " Defectus animæ a Deo peccatum et defectus corporis ab anima mors ; mors inquam animæ prima et mors corporis secunda." Now, Herbert of Losinga's language in general about the Blessed Virgin is so strong that his Protestant editors have continually to protest against it, and on one occasion they exclaim, " This is full-blown Romanism, so much so that mediæval divines of a much later date than Herbert, writing at a time when religion was much more thoroughly eaten into by the Roman gangrene, would hesitate to

use such expressions.\* Can any one then persuade himself that this fervent panegyrist of Mary imagined her to have been unpurified from original sin and void of all grace until the moment that Gabriel saluted her with the words, "Thou hast found grace with God?" In his sermon on her Assumption, after saying that no stain of origin was attached to her, he continues: "By modest parents the modest Virgin is nurtured, and being hidden from everything that might provoke unto vice, was preserved by the presence and munition of the Holy Spirit alone. Whence the Hebrews called her 'Oalma,' that is, hidden—that is to say, free from all knowledge of sin and from all will to it." It is then to us utterly incredible that the writer of these words, or indeed any Catholic writer of the eleventh or twelfth century, should assert that either original or actual sin had to be purged from the soul of Mary in that overshadowing of the Holy Ghost in which the Incarnation was accomplished.

It may be interesting to know that Herbert is not only a new witness to Mary's Immaculate Conception, but also to her bodily Assumption.

To-day the most Blessed Virgin Mary was taken up above the heavens, and in the presence of the holy Apostles her body was placed in the sepulchre. She died. But a body of such excellent dignity could not (as Blessed Gregory saith) long be held in the bonds of death. For it was impossible that that flesh should be corrupted by a long death, of which the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. For if at the Lord's resurrection many bodies of the saints that had slept arose, how could that flesh not rise again which gave birth to the Author of life Himself? With a full and undoubting faith, believe ye, my brethren, that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, made immortal both in body and soul, sitteth at the right hand of God, with her Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, being the mother of penitents, and a most effectual intercessor for our sins with her most gracious Son.

Such, then, was the belief of the first Bishop of Norwich regarding the prerogatives and privileges of the Mother of his God. They have absolutely nothing in common with the opinions of his Protestant editors. To them might well be addressed an admonition of a contemporary of St. Bernard, who, in defending the doctrine of St. Anselm, writes:—

I beg of you, whoever you are, who think that the blessed Mother of God, after the annunciation of the holy angel, and in the coming upon her of the Holy Ghost, first lost either sin or concupisence

---

\* P. 334. The expression which excites this outburst is the following: "In nuptiis commutata est aqua in vinum, virgine faciente miraculum, dum coegit Filium ut faceret miraculum." What do the editors say to "the Lord obeying the voice of a man," in Josue x. 14?

(*fomes peccati*), I beg you, I say, in the name of that same blessed Mother of God, cease, give up your malignity, do not stain that most pure vessel, loose the shoes from your feet which hinder your progress in the right road. You have zeal for God, but not according to science. You think perhaps that you render service to God by your error. But if you do not cease, know that this ground which you trample on is a holy ground, and opens to swallow up the incredulous.\*

If this writer, a contemporary, or almost a contemporary, of Herbert's, writes with such indignation against those who held an opinion far less offensive to the Blessed Virgin than that which his modern editors attribute to Herbert, what would he say, and what ought every Christian man to say, of an opinion put forth by these Protestant writers as their own? Herbert had drawn an argument for our Lady's Assumption from our Lord's fulfilment of His own command, "Honour thy father and thy mother." To this the editors attach a long note, in which they pervert five passages of Holy Scripture, to prove one of the most monstrous propositions that ever emanated from men who have not laid aside all faith and piety. The note is as follows:—

The answer to this argument from the fourth commandment is, that our blessed Lord gradually liberated Himself, not, indeed, from our human nature, with all the sympathies of which He is still invested on the heavenly throne, but from those earthly relationships which were involved in His sonship to Mary. At the marriage in Cana, He taught the Virgin that in the exercise of His divine power she must not seek to control Him (St. John ii. 4). When she would fain have interrupted Him in His preaching, He says, with great emphasis, that the spiritual tie between Him and His disciples must take precedence of the tie of natural relationship (St. Matt. xii. 48-50). When she was eulogized in His hearing for having brought forth and bred such a Son, He again intimated that the blessedness of the docile and obedient disciple exceeded hers (St. Luke xi. 27, 28). And, finally, after making provision for her in His dying moments, He seems finally to devolve upon another the relationship to her which He had hitherto held (St. John xx. 26, 27). So that in His glorified state Christ, though still akin to all humanity, is not more allied to one member of the human family than to another, as St. Paul intimates (2 Cor. v. 16); "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more."

With this specimen of Protestant theology we must couple another by the same authors. Herbert, in saying that our Lord by His Resurrection had been made whole of His infirmity, quotes the text, "His flesh had dried up like a potsherd." The editors rightly explain his meaning from St. Jerome, that as fire

\* Auctoris anonymi declaratio in librum S. Ansel. Inter Opera Anselm, t. i. p. 160.—Ed. Gerberon.

bakes the soft clay of the potter, so the fire of our Lord's passion had made His body immortal and incorruptible. They then continue :—

We do not give it as an idea in the least likely to have occurred to Herbert, being in far too modern a line of thought; but it occurs to us that there is a sense in which the glorified flesh of Christ may be truly said to have dried up in the process of becoming incorruptible. Blood is the principle of the animal life; and accordingly, in none of the descriptions of our Lord's resurrection do we find any allusion to blood in the risen body. Our Fourth Article very significantly steers clear of all mention of blood when it says, "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature." Blood, as the principle of mortality, may be said to be dried up in the glorified frame.\*

A bloodless and a motherless Christ ! These authors do well to say that such ideas are in far too modern a line of thought to have occurred to the Bishop of Norwich, who was a friend of St. Anselm. He who offered daily at the altar the Precious Blood to the Father, and drank It for his own salvation, would not be tempted to the thought that the Price of the world's ransom had been dried up in the veins of his Saviour, any more than that Mary had ceased to be Mother of God. We have heard some of his language about our Lady. His faith in the Precious Blood is expressed as follows, in his Easter Sermon :—

Brethren, we are to be fed with the Body of the Lord, and to be made to drink of His blood. It is bread which ye see before you, material bread; but when in the office of the consecrating priest we come to the words of Christ, that bread is made the flesh of Christ, that very flesh which proceeded from the Virgin, and hung upon the cross, and lay in the sepulchre, and rose again from the sepulchre, and which, not fantastically but substantially, was manifested to the eyes of the disciples, and now standeth incorruptible and immortal at the right hand of God. The same we assert, maintain, and preach concerning the liquor which is made the blood of Christ. A great change of things; but to the word of God nothing is impossible. The word of God was able to make all things of nothing; and shall it not be able to make something of something ? It was possible to the Lord to say : Let there be light, and there was light; let there be a firmament, and it was made; let there be dry land, let there be water, and they were made; and let all creatures be, and they were. And shall God say: Let bread become My Body and the cup My Blood, and shall it not be ? Those things were possible to the word of God; and shall these things be impossible to the same word ? Nay, the most impossible of things is that that should not be done which the word of God biddeth to be done. The reason of these things is searched

for; but it is the highest reason to trust to the will and word of God, and in no wise to make search with fond inquisition into the hidden and secret work of God.

To this passage the editors have attached nine pages of notes, principally regarding Anglican views and disputes as to the Eucharist. They in no way elucidate Herbert of Losinga's doctrine, which is quite clear, and requires no commentary. They say, however, with a curious want of candour, that "nowhere in this argument of Herbert's in favour of the received view does he assert that *after consecration there is no more any real bread and wine in the Eucharist, but only the appearance thereof.*" And they put these words in italics, as if they had made a discovery and scored a point. Surely if Herbert is defending the "received view" of Lanfranc and Anselm, he did not need to speak more clearly and emphatically. Can any man in a sermon say everything so explicitly as to anticipate every possible objection? St. Anselm writes that, "according to the definitions of the holy fathers, it is to be understood that the bread laid upon the altar is changed by those solemn words (of our Lord) into His Body, and that the substances of bread and wine do not remain, but the species remain—that is, the form, colour, and taste."\* When, then, the contemporary of St. Anselm, defending the same doctrine of our Lord's Real Presence, says, "Panis materialis efficitur caro Christi," and speaks of "Magna rerum conversio," and the rest, comparing this conversion with the act of creation, what most distant grounds are there for hinting that his words *might* imply consubstantiation and not transubstantiation?

We can only explain such remarks as the above, on the part of the editors, by their total inability to conceive that any man can take his faith whole and entire, as it is given him by the Church, without mixing with it his own fancies and interpretations.

Thus they themselves seem, in one place, to defend the doctrine that the Body and Blood of our Lord—the same that were born of the Virgin Mary—are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,† and that the elements are not *only* symbols and figures. Yet, with no apparent sense of inconsistency, they teach elsewhere, as we have seen, that our Lord has now no blood at all, so that the wine can, by no possibility, be anything more than a symbol of what once was and has now ceased to be for ever. It is not, then, to be wondered at that men who can thus fabricate theology for themselves, fail to comprehend the position of a Catholic bishop as the simple exponent

\* S. Anselmi Opera, t. ii. p. 165. Ed. Gerberon.

† Vol. ii. p. 186.

of the teaching of the Church. They have discovered some unpublished MSS., and, wishing to make the most of them, they study every word with Protestant eyes, turning every ambiguity and every omission to account in favour of some view of their own. Could Herbert see these volumes, he would surely be surprised to find himself, of all English pre-Reformation theologians, the one on whom the most pains have been spent, and to the least purpose.

To return for a moment to the strange Protestant views which have been thus incongruously thrust into an edition of orthodox Catholic sermons, it is not uninstructive that these twin heresies of a bloodless and a motherless Christ should come from the same authors, though they do not seem to be aware of their connection. In one of his treatises, Father Faber writes as follows :—

In Heaven, and in the Blessed Sacrament, the Precious Blood dwells, incomparably glorified in the veins of Jesus. . . . Yet amid the untold magnificences of the Divine Union it feels its kindred to Mary, as a special joy of its abounding life. Its original fountains are still flowing in their sinless purity, beautified now with the gifts of glory, in the Mother's Immaculate Heart, and the fountain in the Sacred Heart beats in mysterious sympathy with the source from which it came itself. Singular in all its wonderful prerogatives, it yet intertwines the life of Mary with its own.\*

If Father Faber wrote these words with the instincts of Catholic faith, it was with the sure instinct of heresy that they who taught that the Son of God has broken off all filial relations towards His Mother, taught at the same time that the Blood has dried up in His Heart. We cannot write down these things about our Blessed and Adorable Redeemer without loathing ; and this feeling is not lessened by the recollection of him who first (so far as we know) broached some part of this heresy. This was the Emperor Constantine, surnamed Copronymus, son of Leo the Isaurian and Iconoclast. This brutal tyrant one day held a purse in his hand full of gold. "What is it worth?" he said to his courtiers. "A great deal," they replied. Then pouring out the gold and holding up the empty purse—"What now is it worth?" he asked. "Nothing at all," was their natural answer. "Well," he said, "such was the Mother of God. When Jesus was in her womb she was worth much; after His birth she was just like other women."† The English Lollards also taught "that our Lady was no better than another woman, and like a bag of pepper or saffron when the spice is out."‡

\* The "Precious Blood," ch. iv. p. 210.

† Fleury, t. ix. livre 42, p. 36.

‡ Fuller, "Church History," ii. 69.

But enough of this. Let us see what was the tradition of the English Church in the fourteenth century. The nine lessons for the feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in Bishop Grandisson's *Legenda*, purport to be derived from a sermon of S. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, and though no such sermon is included in his printed works, and the controversial allusions seem to belong to a later date, yet the mistake (if such it is) is another proof of the belief that prevailed in mediæval England, that S. Anselm lent the weight of his authority to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as well as to the observance of the feast. The lessons are as follow :—

LESSON I.—Just when I was desirous to contemplate the first beginnings from which salvation has arisen to the world, comes the solemnity of to-day, on which, in many places, a festival is kept of the Conception of the Blessed Mary Mother of God. In former times it was indeed observed more generally, by those especially in whom pure simplicity and humble devotion to God was more lively. But when the presumption of greater science and an overmastering desire to scrutinize everything had pervaded and perverted the minds of many, the simplicity of the poor was despised, and this solemnity abolished as if it had no foundation in reason.

LESSON II.—Those reasoners maintain as a strong argument why no commemoration should be made of the Conception of the Virgin Mother in the Church of her Son, that it is already sufficiently commemorated in her nativity, which is everywhere kept as a feast. She would not have been born, they say, had she not been conceived; and when she came to the light of day from the secret of her mother's womb, it was clear that she had been conceived and gradually grown to human form. Since therefore the full formation of her body manifested to the open world is venerated by all, it would be superfluous to honour that unformed matter, which often perishes before it attains the human likeness. Relying on this sagacity of theirs, and glorying in the strength of their reason, they have not feared to abolish the festival of that most holy Lady, which the simplicity and perfect charity of the ancients towards the Queen of the universe had established.

LESSON III.—Those, however, who are well founded in devotion and charity towards the Mother of their Lord, declare that all the human praise that is offered to her dignity seems to them of little weight if compared with her illustrious merit. Now since her conception was the foundation of the dwelling among us of the Supreme Good, if it incurred the stain of some sin from the origin of the first transgression, what then shall we say? Certainly it was said by a divine voice to Jeremias: "Before I formed thee in the womb I knew thee, and before thou wentest forth from the womb I sanctified thee and made thee a prophet to the nations." Of John, also, the angel who announced his birth declared that "he would be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." If then Jeremias, who was to be a prophet in the nations, was sanctified in the womb; if John who

was to go before the Lord in the spirit and power of Elias, was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, who shall dare to allege that the singular Propitiatory of the whole world, and the unique and most sweet Couch of the only Son of God Almighty, was not endowed with a special grace of the Holy Ghost even in the very beginning of her conception ?

LESSON IV.—But if any one maintain that she could not be altogether free from the sin of our first origin, since it is certain that she was conceived from a legal marriage of man and woman, if this is the Catholic doctrine, certainly I am resolved on no account to dissent from the unity of the Catholic and universal Church. However, when I try to contemplate the magnificence of the operations of the Divine power with my shortsighted mind, I seem to myself to see that if there was anything at all of original sin in the origin of the Mother of God and our Lady, it was on the side of the parents, not of the offspring. Look at a chestnut ; when it is produced from a tree of its own kind its husk is rough and surrounded by thickset prickles ; but the chestnut is conceived in the form of a milk-white liquor, having nothing rough or sharp or prickly either in it or around it.

LESSON V.—Now mark ; if God bestows on the chestnut that, underneath prickles, it be conceived, nourished, and formed quite free from prickles, could He not grant to that human body, which He formed for Himself as the temple in which He would dwell bodily, and from which He would be made perfect man in the unity of His own Person, that although it was conceived among the thorns of sin, yet it should be altogether free from the prickings of those thorns ? He certainly could. If, therefore, He willed to do it, He did it. Now it is clear that whatsoever He has willed most excellent for any one—apart from His own Person—He has willed for thee, O most blessed of women. For He has willed thee to become His Mother ; and what He willed, He effected. Whosoever then on the day of thy conception deprives the Church of God of the joy of that conception, either he does not well consider, or neglects to consider, or is ignorant of the good that has issued from it to every creature of God.

LESSON VI.—Besides this, that maintainer of pure truth, who was called a vessel of election by thy Son from His seat in heaven, confesses that all men sinned in Adam. The proposition is true, and to contradict it would be impious. Yet, when I consider the eminence of the grace of God in thee, O blessed Virgin, as I behold thee not among all things, but in an inestimable manner above all things, so also I hold that thou wast not bound in thy conception by the law of nature that binds others, but by the virtue and operation of the Divinity, singular and impenetrable to the human intellect, wast most free from taint of every sin. For sin alone kept men from the peace of God ; and to abolish sin and recall the human race to the peace of God, the Son of God willed to become man, and such a man that in Him there should be nothing in the least discordant with what made man from God discordant. Since, then, this had to be done, it was fitting that the Mother from whom such an One should be created should be at all times free from every sin.

LESSON VII.—Therefore, if I consider the beginnings of her creation with different eyes than the beginnings of the rest of the descendants of Adam, I beg that no one will turn away his face with a sneer. Let no one, I say, of any piety, and to whom God grants any affection of pure devotion to the Mother of God, try to overthrow this, relying on his own opinion and carried away by his own impetuosity, unless indeed he is certain that it is altogether contrary to the Christian faith. Look, I beg of you, at the conduct of any very great man. Suppose he wished to build for himself a palace exactly adapted to his needs, in which he may himself reside amid a more numerous and festive company, and at the same time give audience and assistance with a very gentle and joyous countenance and voice to all who stand in need of his help or counsel, would he, think you, suffer the foundation of his palace to be weak or dirty, or incongruous and out of harmony with the structure built upon it? I think not, if he were wise, and able to carry out his purposes.

LESSON VIII.—Now we hold with undoubting faith that the wisdom of God before all ages proposed to itself to build a dwelling for its own special habitation. What this dwelling was has been long since made known to the world. For we all confess that this dwelling is that sanctuary of the Holy Ghost, in which, and by which, that same Wisdom of God willed to be joined and incorporated to our human nature, and to show clemency and mercy to all who flee to It with pure intention. That by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost this sanctuary—the hall of universal propitiation—might be built, the beginning of the first foundation is the conception of the Blessed Mary, whom also we call a hall (of mercy). If, therefore, that conception was stained by any sin, the foundation of the dwelling of the Wisdom of God did not correspond or agree with the structure.

LESSON IX.—And how could it be that the propitiation for sin should have one and the same being with sin? What society has light with darkness? Was the Wisdom and Power of God either ignorant or impotent to build for Itself a dwelling clean in every part, and without even the stain of human condition? When some angels sinned He preserved others from sin, and was He not able to keep free from the sin of others the woman who was to be His mother? From all eternity His counsel had decreed that she should be the mistress and queen of angels, and shall we believe that she received a less grace than the angels, and by her conception was thrust into the company of sinners? Let him think this who likes; let him prove it by his arguments who so chooses; let him who likes oppose what I have said; as for me, until God show me that something more worthy of the excellence of my Lady can be said, I say what I have said, and what I have written, I change not. For the rest, I commit both myself and my intention to her Son and to her.

These were the lessons at matins. After prime in chapter was read the following history:—

In the time when William Duke of the Normans first conquered

England, the Danes, being indignant as deprived of their inheritance, got ready a fleet to drive the Normans from England. Seeing this, the most prudent king sent Helsin, abbot of Ramsey, a holy man, to Denmark to restrain their undertaking. After he had strenuously executed his mission and was returning by sea, a great tempest arose, and when the sailors were in despair, he invokes the most Blessed Mother of God, Mary, the refuge of the desperate. And lo! on a sudden, one in Pontifical ornaments\* appears on the waves of the sea, and drawing near the ship and calling the abbot to him, asks: "Dost thou wish to escape and to return home?" He replies, with tears, that this is his earnest desire. "Know then," says the apparition, "that I am sent to thee by that Blessed Virgin whom thou hast invoked; and if thou wilt promise that thou wilt celebrate her conception and cause it to be celebrated by others, thou shalt return prosperously to thy country." "When?" asked the abbot, "or how is this to be done?" "On the sixth of the Ides of December," he replies, "and with the same office as that of her Nativity, the name only being changed." With these words he disappeared, the storm ceased, and they reached England prosperously. Let us then, brethren, if we would enter the harbour of salvation, strive to celebrate devoutly the conception of Mary, the Star of the Sea.

We have not space here to discuss the history of the feast or the doctrine on which it was founded, or the parts assigned to St. Anselm or the Abbot Helsin. The belief in these things was not peculiar to Bishop John de Grandisson. In the very first year of his episcopate, in a Provincial Council, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Mepham, wrote: "Following in the footsteps of the Venerable Anselm, our predecessor, who, in addition to the more ancient festivals of the Blessed Virgin, instituted the solemnity of her Conception, we decree and command that the feast of the Conception be celebrated with festive solemnity in all the churches of our province of Canterbury."† But Grandisson tried to surpass all his colleagues in special devotion to our Lady, as we gather from his statutes for his foundation of St. Mary Ottery; and it is interesting to know the lessons that he either adopted or confirmed for the use of his own cathedral. We are grateful to Mr. Reynolds for their publication.

T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R.

\* Writing of the foundation of Fountains in 1132, Robert of Gloucester says, "Our Levede day in Decembre there before was thorū *angel vorst* byfounde." It was generally, however, understood that the supernatural visitant was St. Nicholas.

† Wilkins, "Concilia," t. ii. p. 552.

‡ See Oliver's "Monasticon Exoniense," p. 269.

ART. IV.—PROJECTS OF THE LIBERALS IN  
BELGIUM.

IT is now two years since we had occasion to sketch the progress of Radicalism and organized revolt against God in the little kingdom of Belgium. Those two years have been fruitful both of good and evil; of good, because the friends of order and religion have remained steadfast at their post, and proved to their adversaries with what tenacity Christians will hold by their faith and their civil rights, and yet set the example of loyal obedience to the laws; of evil, because the forces of Caesarism and Freemasonry have gained fresh positions and thrown out new outworks, and have, thanks to an organized system of fraud, calumny, and intimidation, retained their hold upon the high places of the State, and found, in the control of the Legislature, new arms with which to continue the battle. To outward appearance little change has been wrought; to a passing stranger things stand as they stood four years ago. The latter sees, probably, little to indicate the deadly struggle that is carried on beneath a surface apparently so calm and unruffled; the material prosperity, which is what would first strike his eye, forbids him to suspect the existence of the moral misery which, for the moment at least, is concealed from all but residents in the land. Appearances, however, are proverbially deceptive, and even this mere material prosperity must be precarious, so long as no moral reform intervenes to unite the hostile parties and establish the security of the country on its only lasting basis. Unhappily no such reconciliation has taken place since the advent of the present Government to office; on the contrary, the policy of the majority seems rather to have been directed towards widening the breach between Catholics and Liberals, and towards adding further elements of bitterness to the strife.

It is more especially at critical moments, when the supremacy of Liberalism is at stake, that the fierce hostility of the two parties is most distinctly brought out. Such a crisis was the General Election of June, 1883, upon the happy issue of which the Catholics built great hopes, unfortunately destined to be deceived. A supreme attempt was then made to wrest from the Masonic party some of their strongholds, Ghent, Verviers, Tournai, Charleroi; no efforts were spared on the part of the Conservatives to win the seven or eight seats which would have sufficed to change their minority into a majority. The result of the election is now a matter of the past, and need only call for a passing notice here. But of the many seats they contested the

Catholics only won two at Soignies (an election which has since been invalidated by the majority); Ghent, which with its eight deputies was alone able to turn the scale, after long wavering pronounced, by the small majority of fifty, in favour of its Liberal deputation. This disaster was in no way due to indifference on the part of the Catholics of Flanders; no effort had been spared to bring about a happier result. Electors were summoned back from across the seas; the sick and the bed-ridden were carried from their homes to the polling-booths to register their votes for the cause of civil and religious liberty. During the whole day the event remained uncertain; telegrams arrived hourly in the capital, at one time promising a certain Catholic victory, at another announcing an improvement in the Liberal prospects; it was not until evening that the final result was made known, and the disappointed Catholics learned that the *régime* of oppression and intolerance had won a new lease of life. Even at Brussels itself the Catholics had this time entered the field, and only failed to pass two deputies and a senator by a minority of 1,000 in a constituency of 20,000. On this occasion the Liberal Association of the capital had surpassed itself in bigotry and stupid intolerance. Members of its own party were mercilessly sacrificed to the fanaticism of the extreme section of the Assembly; one candidate being rejected, notwithstanding a life's service rendered to the Liberal cause, because he had hired some shooting from a Catholic who was presumed to devote the proceeds to the Catholic School Fund; another evoking loud murmurs by admitting the truth of an accusation that he had once break-fasted with a priest. But the palm falls to a certain M. Finet, who presented himself before the Association as well fitted to represent his party in Parliament. It was urged in reproach against him, however, that his little girl was being educated in a convent at Paris; in vain he protested indignantly against the calumny; it was brought home to him that although the child was at the moment with her parents, she had been quite recently at the Sacré Cœur, and was only taken home in view of the elections. His cause was now all but hopeless, as such a proceeding was considered sufficient to degrade him for ever in the eyes of the enlightened leaders of the Caucus; still he resolved upon one more desperate effort to regain the confidence of the party. No Liberal, he declared, could show a nobler act of devotion than what he was about to recount. In his country-house, he said, there had existed a private chapel, the only place of worship within several miles; this chapel he had pulled down to prevent his family from frequenting it, and in order to force such peasants as wished to hear Mass to walk some leagues to church. This exploit, if authentic, would have gained

him the day; but, alas! it was not even true; the chapel had already ceased to be used when M. Finet bought the château, and there was, moreover, a parish church close at hand; the plea was, therefore, refused, and the candidate rejected. Such is the prevailing temper of Liberalism; such the spirit of the arrogant party, which dictates its commands to the country. To gain its support a man falsely claims to have perpetrated a deed which would have earned him public execration in any honourable constituency. The final choice of the Association fell upon three extreme candidates, one of whom had openly declared his sympathy with the French Commune. The Catholics, hoping to profit by the reaction which the proceedings of the Association had created in popular opinion, presented independent candidates, and although defeated, the result leaves hope in a not distant future of breaking the spell under which the Liberal Caucus has for so long held the metropolis.

It is hardly necessary, with our knowledge of Liberal electioneering tactics, to inquire how the Ministerial party contrived to obtain the slender majority which has perpetuated their power. The usual system of intimidation on the part of the large manufacturers and employers of labour was more than sufficient of itself to turn the scale in their favour at Ghent and amongst the industrial populations of Hainault, the labouring classes who had votes being forced to choose between them and their daily bread. The other resources of the party were, as may be expected, put into play, and the old worn-out calumnies against the Church were once more brought to the front. The famous "dossier Dumont," which it was supposed had long since been forgotten, was disinterred, and garbled extracts from confidential letters, written ten years before, were printed in the Liberal papers with the hope of winning the votes of a few wavering electors. The Government itself came upon the scene with a new and scandalous electoral manœuvre; the Premier and the Minister of Justice, in addressing their constituents, making an open appeal to the passions of the mob, and intimidating the bourgeois classes by declaring that in the event of a Catholic victory it would be impossible to restrain the populace in the large centres, and that a Liberal defeat would infallibly be the signal for riots and destruction of property in the populous manufacturing districts; the only hope of maintaining order, they declared, lay in the return of a Liberal majority. This discreditable menace on the part of Ministers who were responsible for public order, and who piqued themselves upon their respect for the Constitution and their submission to the popular verdict, was not without its effect. The middle-class Belgian is certainly not behind the rest of the world in looking after his

own material interests, and this unprincipled appeal to insurrection, accompanied by ostentatious measures for repressing the promised riots, gained a considerable number of votes for the Government.

The Liberals consequently won the day. But they were none the less alarmed at the narrowness of their majority, and on the morrow of the election a cry arose from their ranks that the Capitol was in danger. Antwerp remained Catholic ; Ghent had recorded 500 more votes for the retrograde party than at the last election. Whence did this anomaly arise ? Were these large towns, the pride of the country, drifting into the toils of ignorance and priestcraft ? No ; but the enlightened votes of the townsmen were swamped by the ignorant voice of the rustics ; the rural districts overwhelmed the cities ; a remedy must be found unless Belgium was prepared to return to the rule of the priests. A preventive measure was speedily indicated, namely, that certain populous agricultural districts round Ghent and Antwerp should be detached from these towns and united to neighbouring constituencies, thus assuring to the Liberals the supremacy in the large towns. As the constituencies to which the Catholics would be transferred were already represented by Conservatives, the change would bring in to the Liberal party a net gain of a number of seats, and the Catholics would be completely crushed. If the Government have not as yet taken up this proposal for re-distributing seats, we need have no hesitation in saying that when the necessity makes itself felt they will be found willing enough to prolong their period of office by committing themselves to this monstrous electoral fraud. As it is, the system of representation in Belgium is essentially vicious, the rural votes being everywhere overwhelmed by the towns. To cite the example of Brussels alone will be enough to prove that the constituencies are so framed as to be no longer in any way representative of public opinion. The town of Brussels has a large Liberal majority, some of the suburbs and the whole of the outlying rural districts are intensely Catholic ; yet these latter are in reality unrepresented in Parliament. The whole constituency returns sixteen deputies to the Lower House, out of 140 members, and because the Liberals, by reason of their strength in the city itself, succeed in obtaining 11,000 votes, their entire list passes, and the 9,000 remaining Catholic and Independent electors have not a single representative in Parliament, and might to all intents and purposes be without the franchise. A similar anomaly exists with regard to Ghent and Liége, and now the Radicals demand a further manipulation of the constituencies to their own profit. The whole system is monstrous, and has become a mere travesty of representative institutions ; but the evil is likely to continue and even to be

augmented, for it is only by virtue of such anomalies that the Liberal *régime* is able to be propped up and continues to exist in the midst of a thoroughly Catholic population.

The Liberals hoped for more than a mere Parliamentary majority as the fruit of their victory last June; it was confidently expected that the triumph of the Government would be the signal for a general break-up of the Catholic primary schools. Such a sequel to the elections was as much apprehended by the Catholics as desired by their adversaries, and universal surprise was caused last autumn when the Catholic Committees drew up their statistics, and were able to show that, far from losing ground, the cause of religious education had actually advanced, and that the population of the official schools had still further diminished. In spite of the severe industrial and agricultural crisis which had to a great extent crippled the resources of their benefactors, the Catholic schools had made a continued progress, and were more flourishing than at any time since the vote upon the new Education Act. Far from causing the Liberals to pause in their rash campaign, this great moral triumph of Christianity has exasperated them to the last degree, and incited them to rush forward more precipitately into the abyss to which their unpatriotic policy has led them. The expenses incurred in the execution of the Law of 1879 have caused a serious deficit in the Budget. Instead of introducing economy into their finances, the Government seem resolved to carry on this competition between private enterprise and the national treasury to the death, utterly heedless whether both may be involved in a common bankruptcy. The sums lavished upon useless schools and scholarless teachers are doubled. Goaded to fury by the success of his rivals, the Minister of Education seems determined to take no expense into account in order to add still more to their number. Primary Schools, Athénées, Normal Schools, spring from the ground in all directions, no matter whether they lack both masters and pupils, or that the contributions of the people are recklessly squandered in building palaces for education in the midst of squalid hovels, so long as in this mad competition there seems a hope of crushing the voluntary schools by the magnificence of their rivals. A stranger travelling through Belgium is astonished to learn that the superb edifices he sees in course of construction, and which he assumes to be Government or Provincial offices, barracks, or asylums, are nothing more than poor schools, or, at best, Government training establishments. We saw recently, at Bruges, a vast establishment of this kind in course of building. It covers several acres of ground, and will, when completed, be perhaps the largest public edifice in the town. We learned, upon inquiry, that it was destined to be a simple Athénée, and will

probably in Bruges, the Catholic city *par excellence*, never gather under its roof more than 100 inmates. And this we cite as one example only out of a thousand. How it is all to end the taxpayers alone have power to decide; but unless they have the courage soon to raise their voice against such sinful extravagance, it seems impossible to ward off a financial catastrophe at no distant date.

In general politics the Government have followed the course which we predicted two years ago, and have remained faithful to the policy of passing a number of small but harassing measures, in preference to bringing forward any sweeping enactments which might provoke a reaction in the country. The Budget of Public Worship has been from time to time cut down, without any wholesale confiscation of Church property having to be brought under public discussion. Foreign priests, serving in Belgian dioceses, have seen their salaries withdrawn; and, quite recently, M. Bara has suppressed the stipends of about 500 curates, basing this arbitrary measure upon the plea that the number of priests is in excess of the needs of the population. In this manner the Budget of Public Worship will imperceptibly dwindle away, each year bringing a successive diminution of the meagre pittance applied by the State to the payment of its debt to the Church, until, when the Radical party is strong enough to enforce its views as to the complete separation of Church and State, and the abolition of the "Budget des Cultes," it will be discovered that there is no such Budget left to abolish.

In their executive capacity the Ministers have been able to make more rapid progress. The Minister of the Interior has allowed no occasion to pass of manifesting his well-known contempt for local privileges and municipal autonomy, and he has devised a new method for bringing the province and the commune under his control by a wholesale system of annulling local elections. In almost every recent communal election, where the Catholics have passed by a small majority only, the Minister of the Interior, at the instigation of the defeated candidates, has instituted what he is pleased to call an inquiry into the validity of the election. This inquiry is held with closed doors, no one knows what passes there, nor to what process of manipulation the voting papers may be subjected, until one day the electors learn to their surprise that their choice has been annulled, and that on the pretext of corruption on the part of the Catholics, or by reason of an error in the counting up of the votes, the rival and defeated list is declared to be duly elected. Sometimes they are permitted the formality of voting over again, but the first method seems to meet with more favour at the Home Office. By a simple sleight of hand the Minister has contrived, upon his own

responsibility, to change the elected municipalities of such important towns as Malines and Laeken from Catholic to Radical, from independent to devoted adherents of His Excellency, not to mention a host of lesser boroughs. His colleague, the Minister of Justice, has employed a similar talent in the revision of wills, foundations, endowments, and other pious bequests, and has successfully diverted large sums of money to uses the very opposite of those for which they were intended. In this manner nearly all the scholarships or bourses, bequests to hospitals, &c., which had come down from former generations have been secularized and diverted to the benefit of State institutions. The process is a very simple one, as easy as the reform of an election at the Department of the Interior. A person—let us call him X.—has founded a scholarship for ecclesiastical students; forthwith a decree is issued in the official *Moniteur Belge*, somewhat to this effect: That whereas X. has left by will a certain sum for the endowment of a scholarship; that, whereas this bequest is legal in so far as X. leaves money to be employed by his Commune for educational purposes; but that, whereas it is illegal in so far as it creates a privilege in favour of students professing a particular religious belief, the present decree authorizes the Commune to found the scholarship, but leaves it free to decide the nature of the education to which it is to be devoted, and forbids it to confine the same to the use of ecclesiastical students only, inasmuch as they necessarily profess the Catholic religion. Accordingly if the municipality happens to be composed of Liberals the scholarship probably falls to a candidate for admission into a Government school, and X., who perhaps lived long before the invention of Liberal Associations, is made to bequeath his money for the object of extirpating the religion which he had thought he was about to benefit. The above is no imaginary example of what M. Bara understands by the administration of justice; decrees of this type are of almost daily occurrence.

In the domain of private life we remark the continuation of the same system of religious proscription which we have previously commented upon; admission into a Masonic society or the production of some similar certificate of Liberalism being the only passport to success in the Government or the municipal administrations. The liberty of conscience proclaimed by the Constitution is flagrantly violated in daily practice; attendance at church, if brought to the notice of the authorities, being equivalent to a black mark even in the case of such humble officials as police agents, postmen and railway employés. So far indeed is this inquisitorial system now carried, that it is well-known that police agents are obliged by their superiors to subscribe to some Liberal journal, and in preference to the *Etoile*

*Belge*, an anti-Catholic daily paper, supposed to reflect the views of M. Bara himself. This fact, although naturally contradicted officially, has been solemnly affirmed by the policemen themselves, in justification of their taking in a newspaper prohibited by the clergy. Such is the way in which liberty is interpreted by the Liberal party, and during the last four years much has been done towards making their victims painfully aware of this mode of interpretation.

The most remarkable, however, of the different schemes brought forward by the present Government with the object of destroying Christianity and inaugurating upon its ruins the worship of the State-God, the Utopia of the Freemason party, is the project of Revision of the Civil Code, which has been laid before the Chambers in two separate parts during the last twelve months. The Constitution authorizes in a certain manner, without having recourse to a revision of the fundamental contract itself, the presentation from time to time of such modifications of the civil law as the altered circumstances of the times may warrant. It is clear from the context of this article of the Constitution, and the spirit in which the Charter is drawn up, that the fathers of Belgian independence were far from intending to lay down any proposition so rash as that the whole civil law was to be from time to time remodelled, or entirely new systems of jurisprudence instituted at the pleasure of the Legislature of the hour. It can, on the contrary, be a matter of doubt to no candid statesmen that all that the article inculcated was the necessity of removing occasionally from the Statute Book obsolete and antiquated laws, and replacing them by articles more in harmony with the wants of the age ; looked at from this standpoint the recommendation of the National Congress was wise and far-seeing. The Liberal party, however, have seized upon this text of the Charter as a means of steering clear of several difficult points which hindered their so-called reforms, and have interpreted the article of the Constitution in a manner justifiable perhaps according to the strict letter of the law, but totally opposed to its spirit. A wholesale revision of the Code, they argued to themselves, would furnish a pretext for doing much in the way of persecution and social reform, that all the other texts of the Constitution prohibit. Such a good opportunity was not to be lost ; Monsieur Bara accordingly instructed a Commission to draw up a project of revision to be submitted to the Chamber, and naturally enough selected as the person best fitted to compile an impartial code of jurisprudence, one of the most violent and fanatical partisans in the whole of Belgium, M. Laurent, Professor of Law in the State University of Ghent. M. Laurent, although beyond doubt a person of great erudition, has completely neutralized the value of

his learning, and deprived all his works of any claim to serious consideration, by his virulent hatred of the Catholic faith. He appears in all that he has published to be struck by a kind of mental blindness as soon as ever matters in any way affecting Christianity are brought to bear upon his subject. Invective, calumny, and systematic perversion of facts, to an extent that approaches crass ignorance of the subject matter, takes the place of serious argument as soon as the interests of religion are at stake ; when once the topic of the rights of the Church is broached, he ceases *ipso facto* to be a reliable guide. And as nearly all his works have been published with the object of "defending civil society against the encroachments of the Church," we may fairly ask whether after all M. Laurent derives much profit from his learning and forcible style of composition. He is, moreover, *par excellence*, a legist, a theoretical professor of law, and with small practical knowledge of its working ; and a legist, or mere abstract compiler of codes, is, we take it, as utterly devoid of the true spirit of the judge or the legislator, as a professional politician is generally wanting in the qualities which constitute a genuine statesman. The choice made by M. Bara was consequently as bad from a Constitutional point of view as it well could be, but as the Government approached this most responsible of all tasks with political and party ends only in prospect, the Liberal party, who intended the new Code to be only useful to themselves, had every reason to await the result with satisfaction. They have certainly not been disappointed. The Code was drawn up and has been submitted to M. Bara under the title of "Un Avant Projet de Révision du Code Civil, redigé par F. Laurent, sur la demande de M. le Ministre de la Justice." The new jurisprudence was of so novel and monstrous a nature as to horrify many of the Liberals themselves, and universal surprise and indignation were caused by the Government in a certain sense adopting the project as their own by laying it before the Chamber for eventual discussion. M. Bara indeed went further than this, and on the presentation of the first portion of the work to the Parliament, asserted that, save for some small amendments he might ultimately propose, the Code as a whole met with his warm approval. It will be sufficient for our purpose to select a few out of the 530 Articles which comprise the first part of M. Laurent's scheme, to indicate what a social revolution the Cabinet have proposed to the country, and to expose the tendencies of the new system of jurisprudence which a large section of Liberals seem willing to substitute for the ancient order of things. Many of the more profound thinkers of the Continent have for some time been convinced that the Code Napoléon itself, which forms the ground work of the judicial system of so many Continental States—and

of all the Latin races—is opposed in principle to the natural law, and has gone far to sap the respect for authority, and to destroy the organization of the family, which are the two pillars upon which a prosperous society must rest. Be this as it may, the Code of M. Laurent leaves the old Civil Code far behind, and boldly proclaims doctrines which tend to nothing less than the complete substitution of an omnipotent State for all other authority, local or individual. The State, thus elevated to a rank far higher than that of any Oriental despot, is made to replace the natural supremacy of the father in the family by that of its own officials ; it is told to practically take over into its own hands the education of the children ; it is to usurp the authority of the husband in the household, of the master in the workshop, nay, more, of God in the temple. It is created the absolute arbiter of the rights of property, and according to its teaching men will henceforth only hold their possessions at the good will of the Government. Briefly, to use a word of modern origin, the new Code consecrates a system of Caesarism the most complete which can be imagined. If all this is not explicitly written in the texts of M. Laurent's work, we shall see presently that it is the direct outcome of his teaching, which aims manifestly at the destruction of the old theory of the duties of the State. Formerly its interference was only invoked to strengthen or protect private rights or local customs, or to execute laws supposed to exist long prior to its own creation ; M. Laurent would now have us believe that it is the principle source of these rights and laws and that it transcends them all. In a prefatory letter addressed to the Minister of Justice, he distinctly throws down a challenge to the advocates of natural law, and commences by avowing his intention of curtailing parental authority, which he complains that the Code Napoléon had left nearly as it had found it under the *Ancien Régime*.

The section upon marriage raises questions as difficult as they are important. By the Code Napoléon the family, especially in the ascending line, exercises an authority which appears excessive to modern legislators. The authors of the "Code Civil" have not taken into sufficient consideration the *rights of children*. These rights are of general interest ; civil liberty is the companion of political liberty ; or rather, liberty is *one*, and it should preside over all the relations of life.

So the Revolution, after having endowed us with the so-called Rights of Man, is now prepared to inflict upon us the Rights of Children ! What joys in prospect for the nursery of the future !

When we proceed to examine the section upon Marriage thus referred to, we find as the first provision which calls for remark :

ART. 141. The future married couple must have attained their majority.

This innovation, which is open to discussion for purely physical reasons, seems wholly uncalled for upon moral grounds, and would infallibly, in our present social position, bring about a great increase of immorality in manufacturing towns, and, by prohibiting early marriages, do away with what is unhappily one of the only safeguards left for the good conduct of the artisan classes. M. Laurent, however, lays very little stress upon this argument, and takes up an original position of his own, declaring that the modern legislator must look upon marriage in a totally different light from his predecessors under bygone *régimes*. The Christian view of marriage is extremely repugnant to him, as he refuses to admit that its chief end is the procreation of children, or that a Liberal can treat of it as a sacrament instituted for the preservation of continency. Theorist and visionary as his whole work shows him to be, he rises to the higher platform of Platonism, and pronounces marriage to be a contract for the union of souls (*l'union des âmes*), entered into before the law by a couple possessed of equal rights, and in which neither party can claim any superiority or authority over the other. This is his ideal marriage, and he affects unbounded scorn for what he hints to be the gross and sensual doctrine of Christianity. As, then, marriage requires more especially maturity of the soul and the intellect, it is evident, M. Laurent urges, that the age of twenty-one is the very earliest period at which it should be contracted; before this age the mind—especially in the case of the woman—is still immature; she requires before entering upon the married state to complete her course of education, “so as to gain her rights and establish her equality with man.” Can there be found a better instance of the danger of entrusting the interests of the nation to the speculations of mere professors and pedants than that furnished by the mischievous folly laid down in the preceding lines? Let M. Laurent spend a year in the midst of the people for whom he would legislate, let him go amongst the teeming population of the large manufacturing towns and preach there his doctrine of the civil union of souls; if upon his return from this mission he is still prepared to legislate in the sense he now indicates it will be time enough to discuss his propositions seriously.

This estimate of marriage throws enough light upon the value of M. Laurent's teaching as regards domestic life to diminish our amazement when we read a little later in Article 208: “The married couple owe each other mutual fidelity, help and assistance.”

This, our author argues, is a wholesome reform of the Code Napoléon, which was drawn up when men were still too much influenced by the prejudices of the *Ancien Régime*, and clung

timidly to remnants of the old Canon Law, wholly repugnant to the spirit of modern society. That Code lays down a doctrine to which nineteenth-century Liberals cannot subscribe: "the wife owes obedience to her husband." Upon what grounds, asks M. Laurent, are we to be forced to accept this maxim of the subordination of one of the contracting parties to the other? Why is the woman to be held inferior to the man in any respect but that of mere physical force? But since marriage is essentially the "union of souls," the legislator is bound to put aside any question of purely physical subjection, and must only treat of man and wife from the moral and intellectual standpoint. What proof is there of a moral and intellectual subordination of the woman which bygone lawgivers have apparently taken for granted? None, says our author, beyond the statements of the Book of Genesis and some writings of S. Paul, wholly at variance with all the teaching of rational men. What is the Book of Genesis? who is S. Paul? A collection of fables—a visionary—for most thinkers of the age; a compendium of revealed truth for those who cling to the doctrines of a past age. But the State is neutral, it neither believes nor denies, its duty is to ignore, it transcends the wrangling of creeds and sects, and in its loftier sphere lays down rules for the conduct of its citizens regardless of what the Testament may inculcate or the Apostle condemn. Christians are at perfect liberty to believe if they choose that S. Paul wrote under Divine inspiration; but their belief is a matter of private conscience, which cannot be intruded upon the domain of public life. If the wife is really in any way inferior to her husband, it is for natural science and positive experience to prove the fact, but until such proof is forthcoming, let us sever ourselves from doctrines which have crept into our Codes through the timidity of certain legislators who laid too much stress upon the force of ancient prejudices. It is true that the French jurists insist upon the duty of submission on the part of the wife as correlative to her right to protection from the husband. But whence comes this need of protection? Not from any essential inferiority on the side of what has been wrongly qualified as the weaker sex, but from the very injustice which we now seek to abolish—viz., that the woman has been artificially held in subjection by religious dogmas and such barbarous Codes as the English Common Law, which has the privilege of being specially named by M. Laurent. Leave the Common Law, he exclaims, and revert to common sense! Emancipate woman from this degrading control, open to her the paths of public life, give her the same system of education as is accorded to the other sex, above all put an end to early marriages, and in future contracts we shall be able to insist upon the husband and wife having equal

rights and wielding equal authority in the household. To enforce this principle we are gratified with another enormity.

ART. 210. If the husband changes his residence and the wife refuses to follow him the tribunal may authorize a *séparation de fait*.

In other words, husband and wife are at liberty to separate and live apart whenever they so desire, neither having any power to compel the other to return to the conjugal roof; the "*séparation de fait*" differing, however, from the judicial separation in this particular, that, as soon as the married couple tire of their separate existence, they are free to resume relations until the next misunderstanding parts them again. They contract, therefore, to live together, not until "death do them part," but only until there arises a difference of taste or opinion sufficient to render agreeable their mutual separation. M. Laurent finds no better system than this for bringing about his vaunted union of souls and for furthering the cause of national morality. It is gratifying for us Christians, however, to learn that, when S. Paul is set aside, we are immediately led into subversive follies such as this absurd Code contains.

Marital authority having been thus effectually disposed of, and the local Juge de Paix exalted to the rank of supreme arbiter in the household, the Code proceeds to root out what is left of parental rights :—

ART. 217. The husband and wife are bound to support, instruct, and bring up their children. Instruction is compulsory up to the age of fourteen. After ten, the children may be received in workshops and factories, on condition that work and instruction alternate according to the system known as "half-time."

After fourteen the working population are obliged to attend adult day-schools until they shall have attained their majority.

Special laws shall regulate :

- 1<sup>o</sup>. Compulsory instruction in combination with work.
- 2<sup>o</sup>. The admission of children into workshops and factories.
- 3<sup>o</sup>. The instruction and education of adults in schools and workmen's associations.

The next article charges the cost of this instruction to near relatives in the case of the parents being possessed of means insufficient for the purpose ; and

ART. 219. If the father and mother fail to satisfy the obligations imposed upon them by Article 217, they shall be pronounced forfeit of their parental rights (*déchus de la puissance paternelle*) upon the action of any relative or connection or of the law officers. Every citizen is bound to inform the Public Prosecutor of facts concerning the non-execution of the obligation of education which may come to his notice.

In case of forfeiture of parental rights, the child shall be entrusted to a relative or connection, or placed in an educational establishment, or apprenticed at the cost of those chargeable with its maintenance.

Here, in so many distinct words, we find the supremacy of the State consecrated and affirmed as against the rights of the father. This iniquitous proposition, clearly destructive of the whole system of civilized society, is defended at some length by M. Laurent with a variety of specious arguments. He commences by declaring that he affirms no new principle, that the Code Napoléon itself enforces upon parents the obligation of bringing up their children (*les parents doivent éllever leurs enfants*). This word *éllever* M. Laurent declares, means, over and above bringing up, education in the sense of instruction—that is, it implies compulsory instruction in all the subjects which the State may choose to inscribe in its programme of necessary knowledge, from reading and writing to anatomy and astronomy. All this, and more, our author, by a singular *petitio principii*, includes in the terms "bring up," in consequence, his Code insists upon the introduction into Belgian law of the new principle of compulsory education. This, however, is not enough for his purpose; the modern State requires a still larger sacrifice of the most sacred rights of the hearth. Having discovered, by the above ingenious process, that education is a legal obligation, M. Laurent next assumes that the State, as guardian of the Law, must have a means of enforcing this obligation, and must make a further usurpation upon the domain of individual liberty by taking upon itself the power of dispossessing the parents of their authority in the family. Nay, more, since the Constitution, to which his Code must rest subordinate, decrees liberty of education, and admits of free schools, M. Laurent is forced to point out, in a crafty and insidious manner, a way of evading what would otherwise be an obstacle to his designs, and tells us how the State may render this precious privilege a dead letter:—

It can be maintained [he says], and it is my own opinion, that when education shall have been declared compulsory, it can no longer be given in free schools, for it is not an instruction of an indefinite kind, which children are bound to receive, but one which can develop and fortify the intelligence. But the State has no guarantee that voluntary instruction will be given in this spirit; it knows nothing of the teachers, and has no right to take cognizance of them; it does not know their teaching, and has no right of inspection into it. In order that the instruction given in the free schools may be efficient, the State must have guarantees. These schools not being under Government direction, the control of an examination is at least necessary. But this would not suffice; for it is not only intellectual culture that we wish to obtain by compulsory education, but also moral

education, in which we include political education—that is to say, love and respect for our constitution and the liberties it consecrates. But examinations give no guarantees as to the spirit which presides over the teaching. Facts are present to show it; it is useless to insist upon what is clear as day. Besides, therefore, the examination, a permanent inspection is necessary.

The above is a fair sample of the sort of reasoning which the Ghent legist applies throughout his work to the treatment of these grave questions—a constant evasion of the real points at issue, and a perversity in sheltering the weakness of his cause in a series of verbal quibbles.

M. Laurent, with the contempt he has shown for marital authority, can hardly be expected to manifest greater tenderness for the liberty of the parent; nor, having once forced him to send his child to school up to the date of his majority, is he disposed to allow any latitude in the choice of that school. He laughs to scorn the very notion of a "liberty of the parent." "What liberty?" he asks. "Liberty to kill the child? For the refusal to give an instruction to the infant—intellectual, civic, and political—is a moral infanticide, a killing of the soul." And in this complete system of intellectual and political culture we must not lose sight of what latter-day Liberals mean: it must comprehend a smattering of every branch of knowledge, the Minister of Public Instruction having prescribed anatomy and botany as part of the standard of elementary education. For political training we must read a fluency in the calumnies and abominations propagated by the Radical press against religion, its ministers, and all things sacred. The father of a family who withholds all this indigestible matter from his child is killing its soul—whatever M. Laurent may understand by soul—and must, therefore, be declared by law forfeit of his dearest rights! To ensure his speedy punishment, any informer is authorized to intrude upon the hearth and denounce the parent who does not attain his ideal of an educator. Indeed, M. Laurent, who never fails to exalt his own patriotism at the expense of the public spirit of his fellow-citizens, takes this opportunity of lamenting the apathy and selfishness which prevail amongst his compatriots, since, he adds, if only the people were more observant of their civic duties, he would prefer to authorize any citizen to take action against the offending parent and relieve the Public Prosecutor of the task. Such is the *régime* which M. Laurent seeks to impose upon a free people! The laws of Lycurgus are mild and genial beside such a Code; the young Spartans, who were taken from their homes to be educated by the State, were at least taught to honour their gods and their superiors; the reformed Belgian Code would send them to schools directed by

teachers whose first official duty is to ignore the existence of a Creator or a creed. To leave no doubt that he really intends the "godless schools," instituted by the Law of 1879, to be the only houses of education tolerated by the State, M. Laurent refuses point blank to the parent any power of choice in the matter. "The law creates the obligation," he urges, "and it is the law which decides as to its *extent* and *execution*. An obligation, of which the extent and execution are left to the appreciation of the debtor, is a judicial heresy." Before dismissing this subject he advances one more strange argument to enforce his views, by asking how many parents can consider themselves sufficiently educated to be able to instruct their children; how many have the leisure to do so? Clearly a small percentage of fathers of families. Therefore, he concludes, let them leave the education of their children to the only persons competent to impart it—those who have a State guarantee of capacity, the official schoolmasters appointed by the Government. Does our learned Professor not perceive that by this time his perverse method of reasoning has brought him into flagrant contradiction with his own premisses? Starting from the maxim that parents "ont le devoir d'élever leurs enfants," we find him, after wading through a sea of sophisms, landed at the conclusion that, after all, it is the State, and not the parent, which is bound to assume this charge, and all this waste of ink and paper has only conducted him to a monstrous *non sequitur*.

As regards the adult schools, he has not laid down any fixed rules for their organization, preferring to leave the question to the decision of the Legislature; but he considers their establishment in a compulsory form most essential for the preservation of social order. The Communists and Socialists fell into their errors by reason of their ignorance—we are inclined to believe that it was, on the contrary, by reason of the kind of education advocated by M. Laurent—the only hope of rooting out anarchical notions and repressing the evil passions of the mob is in giving the people plenty of schools. He therefore insists that everyone up to the age of twenty-one at least should be forced to spend not less than an hour and a half on week days and two hours on Sundays in a Government adult school!

Lest, notwithstanding all these reforms, there should remain any vestiges of family and individual rights unconfiscated by the Code, a few precautionary Articles are inserted. Art. 348 gives both parents equal authority over the children, the tribunal being called in to decide in case of a conflict of opinions. Art. 363 allows the parents a limited power of correction of their children, but forbids corporal or excessive punishment; the tribunal being again brought into play where a child gives grave dissatisfaction,

and having to decide where, or in what establishment, he shall be placed, and lastly we are told :—

ART. 386. If the survivor of the parents re-marries, the family council shall decide whether parental rights over the children are to continue.

We have selected the above articles from the first part of M. Laurent's Code as giving a fair idea of its spirit; in the second portion of his "Avant Projet" our author treats of the laws regulating associations and corporations, and here are revealed in all their intensity the sectarian spirit, anti-religious passion, and thirst for persecution, which animate the Radical legislist. So virulent is his animosity against the religious Orders in special that his new Code, in order more surely to strike them, is ready to sacrifice all the rights and liberties of associations, whether social, literary or commercial, if only a deadly blow can be dealt at the same time at its author's great bugbear, *la lèpre moniale*, as he terms in one of his legal treatises the religious congregations. In the *Exposé des Motifs*, which accompanies his Project of Revision, no less than a hundred and fifty closely printed pages of folio are devoted to the proof of his favourite thesis that monks, nuns and religious confraternities are mere corporations of robbers, that their property, howsoever acquired, whether by inheritance, purchase, or gift, does not legally belong to them, and can consequently be claimed either by private individuals or by the State.

M. Laurent divides all associations into two classes, which he terms respectively legal and illegal corporations. Under the first category he only admits such bodies as have been accorded a legal personification by the State, and which answer to our chartered corporations. Such are the municipalities and Communes, the State hospitals, the seminaries and vestries (*fabriques d'église*), although M. Laurent would fain withdraw their charters from the latter. Associations of this character enjoy what the French law terms *la personification civile*; they may act in a court of justice, contract or inherit as individuals would; in fact they possess all corporate privileges. The author of the new Code, however, seems intentionally to create a confusion of ideas at this point, and while justly confining the privileges and immunities of incorporation to such bodies as have received a charter, immediately proceeds to rank all other voluntary associations under the head of illegal establishments or corporations, and refuses to recognize not only the privileges, which they have never pretended to assert, but the civil rights of their individual members, consecrated by the most elementary principles of natural law, and further guaranteed in formal words by the Belgian Constitution, whose limits the revision of the Code may not transgress, and

which explicitly declares that Belgian citizens are free to form associations. In face of this positive text of law M. Laurent still maintains that an association which is not a legally incorporated society is also illegal, in so far as an association at all; that because it cannot act at law as an individual, and has not a civil status of its own, it is therefore further debarred, in the person of its individual members, from the exercise of all other civil rights; that if A B and C have agreed to embark their associated fortune in the enterprise X—whether X be a convent, a literary society, or a simple club—then not only is X unable to stand before the law as a separate individual, which in the absence of a State charter we may accord, but A B and C, by the fact of forming an association, which the law formally permits them to do, resign their rights of property, and possess neither individually or collectively. We shall consider presently the terms in which M. Laurent formulates this iniquitous proposition, but for the moment we must follow him through his treatise upon the corporate bodies to which the privilege of State recognition is conceded. These, lest any one should for a moment conceive the idea of incorporating a religious Order, however useful or beneficial its work, are limited to the smallest possible number. Thus Art. 531 of the revised Code declares that “incorporation can only be effected *for reasons of public necessity* by the law, or in virtue of the law.” The reader will perceive at a glance the object which underlies the words in italics. A faction in the legislature, obeying the orders of a sectarian Government, will have absolute control over the charters of corporate bodies, and must refuse to accord them wherever absolute public necessity is not proved. Given the despotic and centralizing tendencies of modern Liberal Cabinets, we need hardly state that this public necessity will only be recognized in the case of official and Government establishments and foundations. Voluntary associations, even in the case of the most useful institutions, need not ask for recognition; far less religious or charitable Orders. M. Laurent, whilst thus providing for the future, is not unmindful of the past, and knowing that, before his present friends came into power and initiated the *régime* of harassing statutes and distorted interpretations of the Code, former Governments had acted in a larger and more generous spirit, he inserts a few articles into his Code for the sake of undoing the milder legislation of his predecessors.

ART. 532. The law may always modify corporations and public establishments, and even abolish them, if the public interest requires it.

ART. 533. Corporations have no other rights than those conferred

by the act of incorporation. Outside their legal destination they have no existence in the eyes of the law.

The property of suppressed corporations belongs to the State, which shall affect it to uses analogous to those for which incorporation was conceded.

The object aimed at is perfectly clear. The civil law had long since allowed a corporate existence to certain religious institutions which were judged absolutely necessary for the mission of the Church; the new Code, whilst preventing a recurrence of this, provides a means of revoking the charters of existing institutions. M. Laurent does not hesitate to name three bodies from which he would at once withdraw all privileges—viz., the seminaries, the vestries (*fabriques d'église*), and the nursing orders of nuns. Besides their suppression, there would follow a wholesale modification of Mass foundations, Catholic scholarships, or *Bourses d'Etudes*, &c., all of which he gives us to understand fall under his definition of corporations. By an imaginary distinction M. Laurent exempts commercial societies and joint-stock companies from the operation of this law, not probably from any respect for the rights of the associates, but merely because his theories, if carried out in all their logical consequences, would raise such a storm and confusion as would suffice to send back his new Code to the little study in the University of Ghent, from which it ought never to have emerged. To avoid this he gratuitously asserts that commercial associations do not fall under the category of corporations, because their objects are of a temporary nature, whereas the essential character of all incorporated society is its perpetuity. What this means, or whence M. Laurent derives this distinction, he does not vouchsafe to reveal; the phrase is high-sounding and will come home to the Radical mind, which is all he seeks to captivate; his party will never require him to waste arguments upon the Catholics, who are after all only the "stupid party" in Belgian polities. All other associations not strictly commercial must share the fate of religious establishments; our author declares himself ready to sacrifice trades-unions, friendly societies, even the Masonic lodges, provided only that churches and convents are got rid of. So in a few brief texts religious endowments are safely disposed of, and the whole temporality of the Church is relegated to the chapter of illegal association, to be dealt with in the second division of the work. Some few charitable endowments, however, might still exist, which it would be impossible for the State to directly abolish. The new Code provides for every possible difficulty, and therefore reserves to the Government the right of modifying, inspecting, or "devoting to analogous uses" the funds hitherto devoted to the service of religion, or bequeathed for definite pious objects by

our naïve and benighted forefathers, who had not foreseen the advent of the Liberal Millennium, and relied too confidently upon the stability of the law. It is true, as we have shown above, that M. Bara, the Minister of Justice, hardly required a special Code for this purpose; he has been able to divert from their legitimate sources the bequests of the faithful, and has found means without having recourse to special legislation, to become as it were the Testator-General of the nation, just as his colleague of the Interior has instituted himself Grand Elector. M. Laurent perhaps fears, however, lest his friends should at some time fall martyrs to their devotion to modern progress. It is always well to be provided with a text of law when it is practicable to make one, if only to free the Minister from future possible claims; the progress of humanity is, alas! but slow and often liable to interruption, nor is even a Liberal Government eternal; the work therefore of reform, secularization, or expropriation, is likely to be carried on more speedily and energetically where there is a Code to shield the Minister of the day from any personal responsibility. Nothing, moreover, is easier to find than an "analogy," where there is a text authorizing you to seek for it; for instance, a man leaves by will a fund to form a scholarship for ecclesiastical students, the Government is, by M. Laurent's Code, at liberty to seize the sum, and naturally applies it to the maintenance of its own schoolmasters, the most analogous use, since the Free-thinking professors of the normal schools are the Positivist priesthood of the future; or again, an endowment for Masses can surely, may argue M. Bara, be better applied and in a manner more comforting to the soul of the testator, by its application to the school-teacher's pension fund, or the indigent children in the State schools.

Here then we have a *résumé* of the situation to which such associations as have the misfortune to obtain a legal footing will be reduced—viz., they may either be allowed to exist on the condition of surrendering their autonomy into the hands of the State, and giving up all voice in the management of their affairs, on the plea of limiting their operations to the objects for which they have received corporate privileges; or they may simply be suppressed at the will of the Government; or, thirdly, they may find their possessions confiscated to "analogous uses." It is clear, therefore, that no corporate societies but those of a purely official or administrative character will be prepared to legalize their position; all voluntary associations will, under M. Laurent's *régime*, be forced to drop into the rank of illegal corporations. On this new ground he is accordingly prepared to follow them up; an armoury of fresh edicts has been prepared to crush them. Having once for all put them outside the law, he proceeds

to invent pretexts for their complete dispersion and spoliation :—

The law must not confine itself to the statement that voluntary associations are not corporations. After laying down the principles which govern corporate bodies, the new Code should strike a blow at those which are illegal. . . .

The greatest of social interests is at stake—the respect due to the law. There is no longer any society when this respect is destroyed.

And, further on, speaking especially of religious Orders, he adds :—

At the present day all these corporate bodies are illegal, and respect for the law is trodden underfoot with an unparalleled audacity.

M. Laurent, however, confronted with the article of the Constitution consecrating the right of association, is at a loss to explain in what way the majesty of the law is disregarded; the treason existing, apparently, in his imagination only, and the tribunals having no authority to enforce the doctrines which he seeks to deduce from the Code. Little abashed, however, he declares that, in order to punish this imaginary breach of the law, the judges must transgress its limits, and in this case become themselves legislators :—

All is illegal, and in so far irregular, with regard to these unauthorized congregations. It is this illegality, this irregularity, which places them outside the pale of the common law in default of a special law determining their position.

Is it possible to imagine a more shameless proposal of arbitrary persecution? The law of the land, which this pretended Code is supposed to merely supplement, authorizes all citizens to form associations, and declares all Belgians to be equal in its eyes; and yet, in the name of this very law, our learned theorist proposes to exclude from its protection a vast category of citizens, for no conceivable reason than that he disapproves of monastic vows and is a disbeliever in the truths of Christianity! But let us proceed. It is not enough to attack religion in its communities of individuals; the dead do not, either, escape his censures. Endowments founded in the past (*fondations*) must be suppressed; the seminaries and vestries, as we have already seen, are classed amongst illegal associations; but there remain further categories of Catholic undertakings which he does not wish to be exempted from his legislation. Men cannot act after their death, he urges; in consequence, it is clear that they have no power to perpetuate their existence by creating endowments. For this reason we are told that all such creations, included under the general term of "establishments" (*établissements*), must be coupled with corporations. This brings our author face to face

with another Liberal nightmare—free schools—also authorized by the Constitution. “Such are the so-called Catholic schools,” he exclaims, “spread over the whole of Belgium. . . . No one may endow a school any more than a convent.” Therefore he includes free schools in his vast scheme of proscription. Of course, as we have already remarked, the wide definition which is thus given to the term corporation would involve the sacrifice of many a purely secular institution, not excepting the Masonic lodges; although, no doubt, if the new Code is ever carried into execution, we may count upon the Liberals discovering a formula which will save the latter. M. Laurent, however, is so eager in his pursuit of religious Orders that we may give him the credit of being indifferent to the fate of his own friends if only the great object can be attained. He poses as a kind of Radical Samson who is prepared to bury himself and his friends calmly beneath the ruins of the social fabric if only the Philistines can be shattered with him. Perish everything, is his motto, provided the Catholic Church be ruined! It will now be necessary to cite a few of the chief Articles dealing with voluntary associations, in order to show how complete is his system. The first Article, No. 537, merely declares what in itself is a sound doctrine:—

Associations or establishments not legally incorporated do not exist as corporate bodies in the eye of the law.

No exception need be taken to this thesis, but M. Laurent proceeds to deduce from it that it is in consequence illegal for the individual members to contract on behalf of their society:—

ART. 538. Every act in which an unrecognized corporation or establishment figures is null and void.

ART. 539. Every acquisition made by such a body, in whatsoever shape, of real or personal property, under any form or with whatsoever object, directly or indirectly, through the interposition of a third party, is null and void.

ART. 540. Those who acquire or hold property for such societies are not the proprietors. They are bound to pay the taxes upon it without exercising any of the rights attaching to ownership.

ART. 541. Members of unrecognized corporations or establishments may hold property in their own name, saving the *right of interested parties to prove by all legal means* that they are acting as trustees, or holding the same for the use of an illegal corporation.

ART. 542. Such illegal corporations cannot take action at law. Third parties can, however, proceed against them as societies *de facto* existing (*sociétés de fait*), and seize their property, saving the rights of those who may lay prior claim to it.

Real or personal actions may be brought against the members or superiors, or those standing possessed of the property in question, whatsoever their apparent quality.

Here, in a few lines, we find the so-called illegal associations, authorized to exist by the law of the land, despoiled of their goods, and their members debarred from all the privileges and rights of simple citizens. The arguments brought forward in support of those monstrous propositions do not stand one moment's examination; indeed, M. Laurent has very little to urge beyond some garbled extracts from forgotten edicts of the time of Charles V. and Maria Theresa, applying to a totally different state of things, and a few recent decisions of the Court of Appeal of Ghent—a conclave of political partisans notorious for rendering services to Liberalism, in preference to pronouncing judicial verdicts. No religious Order in Belgium has claimed to pass contracts, or act at law *quid* corporation; but what possible legal maxim can be found to prevent the superior of the society from acting individually on behalf of his associates? Because, M. Laurent urges, he is only the mouthpiece of an unauthorized corporation which at law has no existence. True, but what right then has the law to pre-suppose the existence of a body, which, in the eyes of the law, is pronounced incapable of existence? Let us take an example, and suppose that a person, whose property is at his own free disposal after death, having no children, wishes to make a bequest to a religious house or to a friendly society. He will not leave the money to the community as a whole, because clearly in this case his will could be attacked, the society which he desires to benefit being at law a *non-ens*. In order, therefore, to draw up a valid testament, he makes a bequest in favour of the superior of the Order, or the president of the society; let us call him A. The law now has only to enforce the intentions of the donator, and to see that the legacy, in default of direct issue, who have a claim which cannot be put aside by testament, is given over by the executors of the will to A. So at least pronounces common-sense, and so would decide every Code of every country that we know of. But not so M. Laurent; it is clear, he says, that the testator wishes to benefit, through the interposition of A, a certain non-existent community; and it is the duty of the Court, in order to frustrate this scheme, to assume the existence of the body of which it is forbidden to take cognizance. The proposition might be discussed if the community in question were illicit, but our author himself admits that the associates have a perfect right to form a society. Moreover, gifts and legacies would be no longer possible if in each case the legatee were forced to prove that every penny which he receives is to be devoted to his own sole benefit, and that no associate of his can ever share it with him. The same glaring inconsistency appears again in Article 542. The unrecognized societies are forbidden to act at law, inasmuch as legally non-existent, but any one is allowed to despoil them

and sue them at law, because *de facto* they do exist. They are non-existent as far as any advantages arising from association are concerned, but they become at once real beings for purposes of confiscation. It is puerile to argue upon such propositions; we can only write them down as barefaced schemes of plunder. We must assume, therefore, that M. Laurent has no wish to convince any but such of his friends as are prepared to enter upon this work of spoliation at all costs, with or without a legal justification. He goes on further to tell us that if the superior of a religious house dies his will is invalid when he leaves his possessions to one or more members of his society individually. Do the latter lawfully inherit? No, he tells us, for two reasons: first, because they are advantaged merely as representatives of the whole community; and, secondly, because, in corroboration of the first objection, they obtain no personal advantage from the legacy, having taken vows of poverty. Yet the Civil Code itself distinctly refuses to recognize such vows; they are binding before no court of justice; they have no civil value; and, by the admission of our author, the legatees are perfectly free on the morrow of the succession, to leave their communities and take all their possessions with them. It is enough for M. Laurent that the society is by common rumour supposed to exist, and to exact such vows from its members, for the latter to be debarred from inheriting, and for the testament to be annulled. He puts upon the head of his cherished enemies a kind of Fortunatus' cap, which renders them invisible to the law when they might be protected, and takes it off again when they pass amongst robbers.

In these days of radical and revolutionary spoliation, a course frequently adopted by the religious communities, as giving greater security for holding Church property, is to hand it over to a third person to be held in trust for them. M. Laurent, as we have seen in Article 540, provides against this, and deliberately inscribes in his Code that the title of the lay-proprietor, however faultless it may be, can be attacked if there is reason to suppose that the property is only held in trust for an unauthorized corporation. This is the crowning point in his system of plunder, and is, perhaps, the most wanton attack upon the rights of property ever proposed to a legislative body; it stamps the whole Code as rank Communism, the more insidious because presented to Parliament in a legal guise.

The possessions of the Church being once diverted from their lawful owners, the question at once arises, "Who is then the legitimate proprietor?" This problem M. Laurent resolves in the next chapter of the Code, which he styles "La Revendication (read Confiscation) des biens detenus par les corporation et établissements illégaux."

ART. 543. Possessions held by unauthorized communities or establishments may be claimed:

- 1°. By the former proprietors.
- 2°. By the communes in the name of the State.

The Code now assumes the mask of protector of the rights of property and those of the family; and pretends to come to the aid of the relatives and heirs who have been robbed of their inheritance by priestly fraud. To these it accords the right of demanding restitution, and of enforcing their lawful claims. But M. Laurent is still distrustful of the mass of his fellow-citizens; he fears that they will give proof of greater honesty and a far more equitable "respect of the law" than the legists. The pretended victims refuse to act; his noble indignation meets with no response from those whose rights he is seeking to defend; contaminated by superstition and oppressed by clerical tyranny, the relatives submit as slaves to the outrages lavished upon them by the monks. The modern "friend of the people" stands out for once in his true light. The grievance-monger, after fabricating imaginary wrongs, turns upon the people when he finds them indifferent to the evils which he seeks to persuade them of; like the friend of humanity in Canning's parody, he has in the end only a kick to bestow upon the needy but craven-spirited grinder.

Alas! the degeneracy of public opinion is such, that hardly an inhabitant of Belgium has been found who understands his civic duties.

Excellent, M. Laurent. You could hardly have rendered a better testimony to the honesty and good sense of your compatriots than this contemptuous mode of declaring that their conception of public morality and yours are so widely different! At the same time you acknowledge that no one but yourself and sectarians of your stamp demand this Code; the people, for whom you pretend to work, do not understand you, or they deem your proposals simple robbery; they know the real law, of which your rendering is a shameless travesty.

M. Laurent, far from being discouraged by this result, proceeds, in the absence of a better appreciation of their duties on the part of the plundered owners, to attribute the spoils to the State and to the Communes. Why? we are entitled to ask. All that we have read in the "Avant Projet" has gone to show that if the Church has grown rich it has been at the expense of the lawful heirs of the donors, and when we come to the point the author of the new Code is the first to admit that the heirs refuse to recognize the theft. They are therefore in their turn put aside and plundered in the same manner as the congregations, and then M. Laurent, all possible competitors being dismissed,

discovers that the property he covets is without an owner, and as at law *les biens sans maître appartiennent à l'Etat*, he is at liberty to attribute it to the State. Indeed, the Code takes every care that the goods which may be claimed in "restitution" shall not pass into the hands of private individuals, if any should be found ready to act as accomplices in M. Laurent's scheme. Every conceivable obstacle is placed in the way of those who may be tempted to take the bait and claim the booty that the Code spreads out; in fact, a special article, No. 552, boldly places the claim of the State in the first rank:—

The former proprietors of the goods to which claim is laid may intervene, within three months after the publication in the *Moniteur* (the Belgian official journal), in which case the goods will be *restored* to them. If they do not intervene they shall forfeit all claim. . . .

ART. 553. Restitution will not be made unless the good faith of sellers, donors, and testators is established. They are of bad faith if it can be shown that they have wittingly foregone their rights of property to the advantage of an unrecognized corporation or establishment.

Art. 554 allows third parties to bring proof that those to whom the property has been thus "restored" have employed it to benefit a corporation. In this case the new owners are in their turn despoiled, forced to pay interest for their term of possession, and further liable to an action for damages. Is it likely that any one, claiming in virtue of the Code to be the legitimate owner of, or heir to, Church property will apply for it upon such terms? Evidently not, nor did the framer of this novel legislation ever intend that they should. All therefore reverts to the Government. The concluding articles of the Code regulate the procedure to be followed by the municipalities in order to legalize this State robbery.

ART. 544. Property, real or personal, held by unauthorized associations shall be claimed by the communes, who are to affect it to the service of public instruction.

ART. 545. Half of the property thus recovered shall go to the commune which instituted the claim. The other half shall form a special fund to be distributed amongst the communes of the country for the needs of public instruction.

But M. Laurent is aware that the majority of Belgian Communal Councils will refuse to join him in his work of plunder; the same abject spirit and the same ignorance of civic duties which characterize the electors are present in their representatives; therefore Art. 546 decrees that:—

In default of the Communal Council, the inhabitants of the commune may institute the claim, giving security that they will be re-

sponsible for the costs, and that they will see the judgment which may be pronounced carried out.

This is not enough ; M. Laurent dreads the danger of finding a commune composed exclusively of honest men, hence :—

ART. 547. In default of the commune or its inhabitants, the action may lie with any Belgian citizen on behalf of his own commune, and under the conditions laid down by the preceding article. . . .

This action must be taken within a year of the publication of the inquiry (in the *Moniteur*), which shall be organized in virtue of a special law.

If no action has then been taken, the State shall lay claim after a month's delay.

ART. 548. Those who bring the action shall be entitled to a fourth part of the property claimed by them and apportioned to their commune.

Here we have in brief the double object aimed at by the new Code ; the destruction of religion, entailing in its ruin that of hundreds of purely secular societies, and the acquisition of a vast fund for the execution of the school law and the organization of the godless national education. To effect this object no means are deemed bad, and at a period when civilized society is threatened on all sides by the forces of socialism and anarchy, M. Laurent does not hesitate to appeal to the worst passions of the populace, and excite the cupidity of the masses, by holding out to them the prospect of sharing in the spoils of private property. The law of 1879 has been tried and has proved a disastrous failure ; the ratepayers have been crushed ; the Treasury exhausted by a deficit which increases yearly ; all resources, legal or extra legal, have been exhausted ; and now the whole law of the land is to be revolutionized, society to be overturned, and the most elementary principles of property set aside, for the purpose of effecting what the country has resolutely set its face against. The new Code can have no other object in view ; its long dreary pages of sophistry and declamation will deceive no one ; the revolution which it is to bring about could be expounded in a very few words. The work, however, with its mock arguments and its pretentious expositions of doctrine has delighted the Liberal Press and charmed the ears of the Radical leaders ; they dwell with fond wonder upon the "subtle dialectic" of their learned Professor. If he prizes this admiration, he is surely welcome to it ; for ourselves we would prefer to sum up the whole of the second part of the Code in three simple propositions, thus :—

1. The Government has a dispensing power over so-called rights of individual property.

2. Property acquired by virtue of this power is at the free disposal of the Government;

3. Saving the rights of those informing or abetting the Government to have a share in the spoil.

By a strange irony of terms the Minister of Justice is selected to lay this monstrous project before the Legislature, and the new Code appears before the public invested with the sanction of the highest judicial functionary of the kingdom. It is immaterial that he may reserve his judgment as to the opportuneness of the reform in its entirety, or that he may withhold his approval from certain of its more eccentric features; Belgian Liberalism has gone very far, but we stand aghast at the fact of a member of any Government accepting such a work as serious. The matter is one for deep reflection on the part of those Liberals who still retain any respect for order, property or freedom. With the forces of Socialism closing in upon them, the Government of a Constitutional Monarchy not only do not reject, but actually in part adopt a proposal which cuts to the root of the existing social system, and justifies the wildest schemes of revolutionary agitators. We do not believe that for the moment M. Bara intends to provoke a vote of the Chambers upon the revised Code; it is more probable he has consented to father M. Laurent's scheme as a threat to the Catholics of what he has in reserve for them; it is quite sufficient, however, to rouse the deepest alarm, that he should for one instant have lent the authority of his name and position to this project. At the present day revolution is not a game which can be played with impunity, and when proposals for confiscation are presented to the populace with the sanction of their rulers, we may be sure that the day of plunder is not far distant. And when that day arrives we can hardly expect the mob to recognize the subtle distinctions of M. Laurent, or draw a line between what is corporate and what individual property. If ever the possessions of the Church are redistributed in the way this Code points out, many a wealthy Liberal will, we can safely predict, rue the day when he began to play fast and loose with the principles upon which society rests. Already M. Janson, the recognized chief of the Brussels deputation, and the leader of an influential section of the Parliament, has commenced a series of meetings, and opened a regular campaign for the confiscation of the churches and the spoliation of the religious Orders. The support of those who think like him, will in many a crisis be essential to the Government, which may be forced, at no distant date, to accord an instalment of the promises held out by the acceptance of M. Laurent's Code. *Facilis descensus Averni!* M. Janson himself is far from being the most extreme of Radicals; a new party is rising, more revolutionary still, which will wring

from him the same concessions which he now extorts from MM. Frère Orban and Bara ; voices are already heard urging, justly enough, that this scheme is illogical and incomplete, that a law is sovereignly unjust which would only confiscate the property of the bishop and the monk, and would pass over that of the capitalist and the merchant. The Government has taken, without reflection, listening only to the promptings of party passion, the first step towards the precipice ; let it continue its course a little further, and the masses, no longer restrained by religion, or awed by respect for their rulers, will complete the work of destruction.

The close of the last Session of Parliament, which was carried on far into August, had other unpleasant surprises in store for the Catholics. Until the new Code is passed the possessions of the Church cannot be devoted to the service of public instruction, and the Bourses and foundations, which M. Bara has diverted into the State coffers, are only a drop in the ocean of public expenditure. It was necessary, therefore, either to check the lavish expenses of the schools or find some means of making up the deficit which they caused in the Budget. The first course was supremely distasteful to the Liberal party, being tantamount to an acknowledgement of the failure of their educational policy ; the only resource left to them, therefore, was to present to the country the first instalment of the bill which four years of Liberal Government had run up. In the month of May the Minister of Finance declared that the deficit for the current year already amounted to over twenty-six millions of francs, more than a million sterling—a very handsome sum for a country like Belgium. This bill must be paid, and the only way to do so, unless the Chambers were prepared to sacrifice the grand cause of National Education, was by increasing taxation to that amount. Various Government Bills were consequently introduced for raising the sum required, and establishing a permanent addition to the national taxes. Duties on coffee, spirits, tobacco, cocoa and vinegar ; new direct taxes upon houses, horses and servants ; stamp duties on shares, dividends, stock transfers and insurance premiums ; such were the sacrifices demanded in the "grand cause" of Catholic persecution ; all these duties to be levied not for one year only, but to be voted as permanent charges upon the National patrimony. This was all the Government had to show as the result of the School Law of 1879. To their credit, be it said, a large section of the Extreme Left or Radical party joined the Catholic Opposition in resisting these exorbitant demands. To saddle the country with an annual burden of a million sterling, which could be avoided by a more economical management of the finances, was, they urged, a veritable iniquity ;

consequently M. Janson and his friends were resolved to oppose the Government on this occasion with energy and vigour. This coalition was strong enough to cut down some of the more exorbitant of the Ministerial proposals, but did not avail to prevent the Government from obtaining somewhat over a half of their new taxes. It is true that even this result was obtained by the barest majority, in two cases by one vote only, and in face of the most strenuous popular opposition—the country being fully aware that it was to be taxed for political purposes only, and for the greater glory of Liberalism. The present Cabinet, however, is accustomed to carry its reforms by narrow majorities and in defiance of public feeling, and the new taxes are already inscribed on the Statute Book—one more monument to that disinterested Liberalism which only came into power by promising a reduction of national expenditure.

According to the usual policy of the Cabinet it was necessary after this victory to throw a sop to Cerberus, and to purchase this advantage by the surrender of some Constitutional principle. The Government, therefore, looked about for a concession with which to reward its faithful partisans who had so nobly sacrificed their personal convictions on the altar of party. The advanced Liberals had for some time been clamouring for an extension of the suffrage and the introduction of a Bill of compulsory education. The Government paid the price of its existence with its assent to both of these demands. Simultaneously with the introduction of the new taxes, M. Frère Orban laid before the House a compulsory education Bill and a project of electoral reform. With the former we have not now to deal, the lateness of the season having forced the Cabinet to reserve the discussion for another Session. Let it suffice to remark that the measure contains all those dispositions which M. Frère Orban a short time since pronounced to be intolerable and unjust, and which he declared that his Cabinet would never be induced to consent to.

The electoral reform was a more difficult matter to deal with. The legislative franchise could only be lowered by a revision of the Constitution, to which at present neither of the two parties in the Chambers were disposed to agree. In the case of the provincial and municipal assemblies things were different, and the Government saw its way to some useful reforms. In those bodies the Catholic and National party had a commanding position, and a carefully managed reform might have a beneficial result in unseating some of the enemies of Liberalism. For in treating of electoral reform, as imagined by Belgian Liberals, we must not confound a reform with an extension of the suffrage; a few hare-brained Radicals might be willing to risk all from a love of pure

democracy and expose the country to the danger of a clerical reaction, but the true Liberal takes reform to mean the disfranchisement of his political adversaries and the admission of new friendly voters. The advanced Liberals had already come forward with a proposal, which, grotesque and unpractical as it might seem, appeared to the Government capable, with certain modifications, of producing good results; this scheme, absurd in principle and illogical in statesmanship, was the substitution of intellectual capacity for a money qualification of electors. The Cabinet decided to sacrifice once more its convictions and assent to this proposal by combining the two qualifications. Intellectual capacity is, however, a difficult quantity to gauge, and it would be possible for the Catholics to claim its possession as well as the Liberals, whereas such a pretension is quite inadmissible in the nineteenth century. An examination for the electorate would therefore be necessary, and a certificate of school attendance must be exacted as a preliminary to examination. As the free schools were exempt from Government inspection, and were, consequently, not recognized by the State, they must be excluded from the advantages of the reform. Upon these lines the Government thought a good Bill might be drawn up, and a measure in this sense was presented to the House immediately after the introduction of the projects' of taxation. The chief principle of the Reform Bill may be thus resumed; universal suffrage at the Provincial and Communal elections for all those who can reasonably be presumed likely to vote for Liberal candidates, exclusion of those not possessing the old money qualification (which was retained in the Bill), who would probably support the Catholic party. The suffrage was therefore accorded to Government functionaries and employés (a formidable army in this centralized country), with whom the need of daily bread was a powerful aid to Liberal convictions; to professors and pupil teachers in Government schools; to officers of the army, doctors, lawyers and members of the liberal professions; and, lastly, to those who, after a certain period of residence in a recognized normal or elementary school, should pass an examination in the subjects required by the standard. Here was a Reform Bill after the Liberal heart, which it is needless to say was carried, although again only by a small majority, several Radicals having the honesty to join the Right in pressing an amendment extending the suffrage to all who could read, write, and count, without a certificate of school attendance. The Government succeeded in rejecting this amendment by their now famous majority of one, the vote in question emanating always from a venerable but doting member of the House, who rendered great service to his country in 1830, but whom fifty-three years of Parliamentary labours

have rendered less lucid in perceiving what is at the present day conducive to the common weal.

A Reform Bill which would only create new Liberal electors and eliminate no Catholics was, however, but an imperfect extension of the suffrage. This flaw in the Bill was happily detected by a faithful adherent of the Government, who at the last moment hurried through an amendment, to the delight of the Ministers, which disfranchised 15,000 rural electors on the false pretext that they did not possess the requisite money qualification. The crowning stone was thus put upon the edifice, and one more injustice was voted by a docile majority. The Government now looked upon their work and found it good, and the fifth Session of the Liberal Parliament was closed, the deputies being sent home to rest and meditate upon fresh schemes for 1884.

---

#### ART. V.—IRELAND IN THE TIME OF SWIFT.

IRELAND in the days of Swift was laid prostrate by the fortunes of war. The battles of the Boyne and Aughrim had been fought and lost by the adherents of the imbecile James, and the land seemed covered with a black funeral pall of hopeless misery.

The Boyne was fought on the 1st of July, 1690. Two causes decided the event in favour of William. His army was greatly superior to that of his opponent in point of numbers and in all the munitions of war; his followers had also the animating consciousness of being commanded by a brave and skilful leader, while the army of James, composed of men individually brave, was dispirited by the incapacity of his Majesty, who took no part in the contest, but looked on at it from the hill of Donore.

At the battle of Aughrim, fought in July, 1691, the Irish enjoyed the advantage of King James's absence. Their commander, the French general St. Ruth, was brave and not unskilful, but he was vain, presumptuous, self-confident, and obstinate. Victory, during the engagement, seemed to hover doubtfully from one side to the other. The Irish were triumphant on the right wing and in the centre. Their officers congratulated each other on the apparent prospect of success, when St. Ruth was killed by a cannon-ball, and confusion consequently overspread the army. Defeat followed.

Limerick was the last place that held out for King James. It was besieged by William on the 9th of August, 1690. The

inhabitants made such a gallant defence that William raised the siege, having lost 2,000 men. The attack was renewed on the 25th of August, 1691, under General Ginckle. After a struggle, which lasted for several weeks, the city surrendered on the conditions embodied in the well-known Treaty of Limerick. By this Treaty the Catholics were promised the exercise of their religion in a manner as free and unfettered as in the reign of Charles the Second. It was also provided that all the inhabitants of the counties of Cork, Limerick, Clare, Kerry and Mayo, who had taken up arms for King James, should retain their estates and practise their callings and professions unmolested. The Catholic gentry were allowed to keep arms, and were not required, by the Treaty, to take any other oath than the oath of allegiance to William and Mary.

On these terms the city of Limerick surrendered. The terms were shamelessly violated by the victorious party. Not a single condition was observed. Laws were passed inspired by the utmost anti-Catholic malevolence, which deprived the Catholics of every privilege of citizenship, and of nearly every other means of livelihood than the agricultural. About 12,500 of the Irish army accompanied the illustrious Sarsfield to France after the surrender of Limerick, and formed the commencement of the Irish brigade, which was destined to win honours in the service of their adopted country. "Perhaps," says our ablest historian, Mr. Lecky, "the most deplorable characteristic of the time was the complete absence of all public feeling, of all hope, of all healthy interest in public affairs. The Irish nation had as yet known no weapon but the sword. It was broken, and they sank into the apathy of despair."

Concurrently with the breach of the articles embodied in the Treaty, the English Legislature attacked the industrial resources of Ireland by a series of laws designed to crush every form of commercial, manufacturing, or even agricultural effort, which could be supposed to compete with the corresponding industry in England. The Irish woollen trade had flourished, notwithstanding the Jacobite wars and the unsettled condition of public feeling that resulted from the vast confiscations of the seventeenth century. Its success alarmed the English manufacturers, who accordingly engaged the assistance of their Parliament and their Monarch to extinguish it. Long before this, Sir William Temple had written to the Irish Viceroy:—"Regard must be had to those points wherein the trade of Ireland comes to interfere with that of England, in which case the Irish trade ought to be declined, so as to give way to the trade of England." Temple's words gave accurate expression to the prevailing policy. By an English Act, introduced in 1698 and carried in the following

year, the Irish were prohibited from exporting their woollen manufactures, not only to England, but to all other countries. This Act was a marvel of complex pravity. It not only annihilated the chief manufacture of Ireland, consigning to total destitution a large population, but it was also an insolent assumption of legislative power over Ireland. The misery which it produced was so intense and so widely diffused, that for many years afterwards every unfavourable season produced an actual famine. In fact, the general results of the policy of which it was a part, reduced Ireland to a condition of decay and disaster similar to that which in our own day has resulted from the Legislative Union. Vast crowds emigrated to America. Smuggling—chiefly of wool to France—was largely practised by all classes. I have seen a curious tract in defence of the prohibitory system, written by a Protestant clergyman in 1721; the treatise was entitled : “The Sin of withholding Tribute by running of Goods, concealing of Excise, &c., laid open and addressed to the Trading Part of the Nation:” by Jasper Brett, M.A., Chancellor of the Cathedral of Connor. The reverend gentleman evidently thought—or pretended to think—that it was the duty of the people to submit without a murmur to starvation inflicted by inhuman tyranny. He was probably writing in hope of professional promotion.

But what was the Irish Parliament doing all this time? Did it make no effort to resist the adverse power that made such ruthless havoc in the country it was supposed to govern?

The Irish Parliament unhappily partook of the weakness that the revolution of 1688 had entailed on the country. Its members were personally interested in maintaining the confiscations. The owners of forfeited estates looked to England to assist them in keeping their territorial gains, and were therefore afraid to make an effectual stand against England in defence of the commercial and manufacturing interests of Ireland. Their chief anxiety was to keep the Catholics in chains. When, in 1698, the Lords Justices officially announced to them the blow struck by England at their staple manufacture, they timidly answered “that they hoped to find such a temperament in respect to the woollen trade that the same might not be injurious to England.”

Such was the state of Ireland at the end of the seventeenth and the commencement of the eighteenth century; the Catholics of eminent ability exiled from a land that afforded no opening for their energies; those who remained at home prostrated by the violation of a solemn Treaty; the Protestants, alien in feeling from their country, depending on English assistance to retain the confiscated estates and to trample down their Catholic

countrymen, and repaying that assistance by scandalous political servility to the power that crushed their trade and starved their people.

There was, however, among the Protestants, a man who was destined to arouse the nation from its torpor. In the Court of Prerogative, Dublin, is recorded the marriage licence of Jonathan Swift and Abigail Erick, dated June 25th, 1664. The son of that couple was the renowned Jonathan Swift, who first saw the light in one of the houses of Hoey's Court, a small quadrangle of dingy brick tenements between Werburgh Street and the steep, narrow passage known as the Castle Steps. He was born on the 30th of November, 1667. He was a posthumous child. His father had exercised the profession of an attorney, and filled the office of steward to the King's Inns Society. The attorney, at his death, left his family so poorly circumstanced that the early years of Swift were passed in the sordid privations incident to poverty. His spirit was indomitably proud, and his pride was exasperated by the painful condition in which from the earliest period he was placed. He never could bear to be considered an upstart. His immediate ancestors belonged to the younger branch of the ancient house of Swift in Yorkshire, one of whose members, Barnham Swift, had been given the title of Viscount Carlingford, in the Irish peerage, in 1627, but died without male issue in 1634. The consciousness of gentle descent increased the bitterness of poverty. At an advanced period of his life, he tells Lord Bolingbroke that his birth is derived "from a family not undistinguished in its name;" and the feeling which prompted this boast is apparent in his anxiety for the accurate emblazonment of his armorial bearings.\*

The personal character and early career of a man whose name is indelibly written in Irish history, are of enduring interest to his countrymen. At the age of six years Swift was sent to the school of Kilkenny, where his mother was unable to defray the expense of his education. The money for this purpose was contributed by his uncle, Godwin Swift, a barrister, whose remittances were, however, so scantily doled out that the nephew was restricted to the barest necessities of existence.

In his fifteenth year he entered Trinity College, Dublin; and among the *alumni* of that university there has seldom been a student who, destined to subsequent distinction, gave less promise than Swift of intellectual eminence. He was self-willed, wayward, and eccentric. His native spirit of insubordination had doubtless much to do with his neglect of college rules and his defiance of college authorities, as well as with the indolence

\* Or, a chevron nébulé, argent and azure, between three bucks in full course, vert. See "Journal," 24th February, 1712.

manifested in his studies. Yet it is also probable that chill penury repressed his "noble rage," and at once galled his pride and disheartened him from the plodding labour to which it has sometimes stimulated the poverty-stricken student. Whatever be the cause, Swift was one of the most rebellious and unmanageable of college lads. He neglected chapel, roll-call, lectures ; he frequented the low taverns of Dublin, not for purposes of dissipation, but to while away the heavy hours in the only society accessible to his miserably straitened means. The natural result of such conduct was his inability to gain the degree of Bachelor of Arts, which, some time after and not without much difficulty, was conferred upon him through the interest of some friends.

During his inglorious college career, he was chiefly supported by the niggardly supplies remitted by his uncle Godwin. These were so scanty and so irregular that he was at one time utterly destitute of the means of existence, when his wants were unexpectedly relieved by an opportune gift from one of his cousins who was settled as a merchant at Lisbon.\* At that period he shared the general belief that Godwin was wealthy, and wanted the will, not the means, to befriend him. The fact, however, was that Godwin had seriously impaired his fortune by unlucky speculations, which deprived him of the power of more effectually assisting his nephew. In 1688 Godwin died ; and Swift, deprived of the meagre and apparently reluctant assistance he had received from that relative, went to England to consult his mother, who then lived in Leicestershire, concerning the course of life he should thenceforth adopt. She suggested that he should seek the patronage of Sir William Temple, whose wife was her relation and whose father had reckoned Godwin Swift among his intimate friends. Sir William resided at Moor Park, in Surrey, where he had, in the midst of a wilderness, created a sort of Dutch paradise, in which terraces, fountains, parterres, statues, clipped trees, and geometrical arbours, were arranged in the formal taste which had already been introduced from Holland into England. Sir William Temple was pleased with the capacity which his practised eye discerned in the youth, and engaged him as his secretary, at a salary—a wretched one undoubtedly—of twenty pounds a year, in addition to his board. The situation was galling to his pride. It indeed afforded him a temporary home and the means of subsistence ; but many years afterwards

\* "I have," says Swift, writing from Dublin in 1737, "three or four cousins here who were born in Portugal, whose parents took the same care (namely, to register their births in some London parish), and they are all of them Londoners."

he remembered with bitterness that Sir William had "treated him like a schoolboy."

As time wore on, his position improved. He took advantage of his leisure to compensate by hard study for the time he had wasted in idleness at Dublin. The University of Oxford conferred on him the degree of Master of Arts in 1692. He naturally expected that Sir William Temple, whose wife was his kinswoman, and who had given him a miserable salary for his services as secretary, would employ his undoubted influence to procure for him a tolerably lucrative employment. But Temple's patronage was very inefficient. He appears to have been one of those persons whose sentiments of friendship evaporate in kind words and professions of regard, and who are scarcely capable, without some extraordinary stimulus, of active exertion to promote the welfare of a friend. It is indeed true that when Swift, wearied and heart-sick with hope deferred, announced his intention of quitting Moor Park, Temple offered him a place worth £100 a year in the Irish Rolls Office. But the offer was made with such coldness that Swift rejected it. He had previously contemplated becoming a clergyman, and he now resolved to adopt that profession, as Temple, by his offer of otherwise providing for him, removed from him the reproach of entering the Church for a livelihood. He parted from his patron on unfriendly terms, and repaired to Ireland to obtain ordination. But in Ireland he found, to his unspeakable mortification, that the bishops of the State Church in that country required as an indispensable preliminary that he should obtain a recommendatory letter from Temple. They had not forgotten his indolent and insubordinate career at the Dublin University, and they naturally demanded a certificate that the candidate for Orders had mended his ways. Swift, who entertained towards Temple resentful and exasperated feelings, could not brook the humiliation of asking him for a letter of recommendation. For several months he abstained from making the painful request. At length the pressure of necessity proved too strong for his pride. He asked for and obtained the letter. He received ordination, and was immediately appointed to the small benefice of Kilroot, in the diocese of Connor, of which the income was £100 a year. But Sir William Temple had begun to feel the want of his society, and pressed him to resume his residence at Moor Park, with so much kindness that he found it difficult to refuse. He accordingly quitted Kilroot and returned to Moor Park, where the mode of his reception and the position thenceforth assigned him in the family were calculated to efface all the painful recollections connected with his former sojourn. He was now treated as a friend and placed on terms of social equality with his patron, who consulted him on affairs of importance, and who introduced him, not only to the

principal statesmen of the period, but also to King William, who occasionally came to Moor Park. When Temple was prevented by the delicacy of his health from accompanying the king through the grounds, Swift was sometimes appointed to attend his Majesty in Temple's place. The king was very affable; instructed the young Irishman in the Dutch mysteries of raising asparagus, and also gave him a more substantial mark of royal favour by the offer of a captaincy of horse, which the ex-rector of Kilroot declined to accept. Temple had learned to form so high an estimate of Swift's abilities that he once employed him to reason the king into sanctioning triennial parliaments. The king's prejudices on that subject were invincible; so that Swift had only the barren honour of pleading an important cause with a royal disputant.

It was during Swift's second residence at Moor Park that he formed the acquaintance of Esther Johnson, better known as Stella; whose father, now dead, had been a merchant in London, and younger brother of a gentleman of good family in Nottinghamshire. The young lady and her mother resided at Sir William Temple's house. Swift felt interested by the artless and endearing manners of the girl, and volunteered to assist in her education. Her charms, both of person and mind, have been celebrated by biographers. Her beauty was of a pensive cast, and the expression of her lovely countenance was eminently intellectual. Some of her eulogists say, that without the slightest tinge of pedantry, without the least resemblance to the *femme savante* of comedy, she had made such excellent use of the library at Moor Park that she had acquired a large knowledge of literature, and had even explored philosophical systems. Whatever she had acquired or explored, it is certain that we cannot reckon orthography among her acquisitions; for Swift, in his Journal, occasionally rallies her on her defective spelling, and enumerates fourteen ordinary words which she had mis-spelled in a single letter. This, however, is scarcely a disparagement of Stella, when we bear in mind the general state of female education at that period. It is certain that she read a good deal, that she had an excellent natural capacity and great conversational talent. We cannot doubt the concurrent testimonies that ascribe to her the graces of lively wit and fascinating manner. It was natural that a being so gifted, and whose gifts had been cultivated to a considerable extent under Swift's care, should make an indelible impression on his mind. To her other attractions was added the charm of the sweetest temper and the most affectionate disposition. The attachment on Swift's part was purely what is styled platonic. They felt for each other intense intellectual admiration.

Swift's hatred of English domination in Ireland stands out in strong contrast to the principles professed by his patron. Temple, as we have seen, considered that every Irish interest should be sacrificed to English monopoly. The statesmen who visited Sir William were in full accord with this sentiment. Their anti-Irish principles found no responsive chord in Swift, although the time was yet distant when he was to make his mark on Irish politics. He remained at Moor Park during the latter years of Temple's life, assisting the old statesman in his literary occupations, enlarging his knowledge of the world and of public affairs by intercourse with leading politicians, and doubtless deriving from that intercourse the intense contempt for the whole race of courtiers which he has expressed with such cynical bitterness in "*Gulliver's Travels*." In 1699 Temple died, bequeathing to Swift a sum of money and all his manuscripts. He had also obtained from the king a promise to appoint him to the first vacant prebend at Westminster or Canterbury. This promise William did not perform. Swift vainly attended the Court, and dedicated Sir William's posthumous works to the king, who treated him with total neglect. It may be here remarked that, notwithstanding the reconciliation in 1695 between Swift and Temple, some remains of aversion to the Temple family appear to have lingered in his mind; for in his *Journal to Stella* (September 9, 1710), he thus writes of the late statesman's nephew: "I thought I saw Jack Temple and his wife pass by me to-day in their coach, but I took no notice of them. I am glad I have wholly shaken off that family."

Shortly after the death of Sir William, Swift accepted the twofold post of chaplain and private secretary to the Earl of Berkeley, one of the Lords Justices of Ireland. From the secretaryship he was soon displaced by the intrigues of a person named Bushe, who successfully manœuvred to obtain that situation for himself, under the pretext that it was incompatible with Swift's position as a clergyman. Lord Berkeley promised Swift amends, which he speedily had the means of making. The valuable deanery of Derry became vacant, and Swift naturally expected the appointment. But here he was again thwarted by Bushe, who contrived to obtain the patronage of the deanery, which he refused to sell under a thousand pounds. Swift was indignant, and vented his rage in a very unclerical execration of Bushe and the Earl. Lord Orrery states that Dr. King, who was then Protestant Bishop of Derry, interfered to prevent Swift's promotion on the ground of his youth, and his presumed unfitness to guard the interests of Episcopacy from the surrounding host of Presbyterians. As some compensation for this disappointment, Lord Berkeley gave him the rectory of Agher, and the vicarages

of Laracor and Rathbeggan. In 1700 he was further appointed to the prebend of Dunlavin; and the union of the four preferments raised his income to nearly £400 a year. Up to the date of these appointments he retained Lord Berkeley's chaplaincy, although in the heat of his wrath he had prayed for confusion to his lordship and Bushe as "a couple of scoundrels."

From Dublin Swift travelled, it is said on foot, to Laracor, where he entered the curate's house without ceremony, introducing himself as that functionary's "master." When he had sufficiently amused himself with the awe he excited in the curate's simple family, he exchanged the domineering and imperious style of his *entrée* for one of cordial kindness, and soon inspired his new friends with feelings of attachment. At Laracor he read the service of his Church twice a week, preaching always upon Sunday.

We see Swift now established in his native country, the anomalous condition of which must have been carefully scrutinized by one who noted whatever he saw, and who remembered whatever he noted. His Protestant parishioners were not numerous. I do not know the proportion they bore to the Catholic majority around them; some years later\* Primate Boulter wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, that in Ireland there were probably five Papists for one Protestant, and this was perhaps the proportion borne by the Catholics of Laracor to their Protestant neighbours. Swift, as an Anglican Churchman, desired that the people should adopt the Protestant religion; but, as we shall hereafter see, he had not the least disposition to embark in a crusade of theological controversy. His idea was a much more simple one. Mass could then be only tolerated when celebrated by registered priests. The Protestant authorities encouraged informers against priests who, unregistered, performed the Catholic liturgy. The Commons had unanimously resolved "that the prosecuting and informing against Papists was an honourable service to the Government." Swift could not stoop so low as to take any personal share in "that honourable service;" but his language shows the source to which he looked for the conversion of the Irish Catholics to the English religion. "The Popish priests," he says, "are all registered, and without permission (which I hope will not be granted) they can have no successors, so that the Protestant clergy will find it, perhaps, no difficult matter to bring great numbers over to the Church." He thought, apparently, that the Irish people could not do without some sort of religion; and that if deprived by law of the worship of their own Church, they might, *faut de mieux*, take up Protestantism as a sub-

---

\* In 1727.

stitute. But notwithstanding the religious intolerance manifested in this instance, Swift was too much a man of the world to carry theological dislikes into private intercourse. He lived on terms of friendly intimacy with the Catholic poet Pope, with the Catholic Martha Blount, and with other members of the ancient Church. He promised a Catholic lady whom he invited to his house to give her the society of a priest, who, he said, was twice as old as himself. He seems to have had an occasional glimpse of the evident truth that the material interests of Ireland must suffer from laws directed against the religion of the great majority of the nation; but if such a vision crossed his mind it produced in him no effort to liberate the Catholics from penal bondage.

Meanwhile, the material interests of Ireland occupied Swift's attention. He saw and deplored the horrible condition of popular suffering to which the country was reduced by the legislation which aimed at crushing out Irish manufacturing and commercial enterprise. Of that legislation I have already given a slight outline. I may here remark that so elaborate and comprehensive was the malignity of the English Government, that it included not only the land but the sea in its scope. Mr. J. A. Blake, M.P., has recently reminded the public that, in the seventeenth century, effective measures were adopted to destroy the Irish fishing interest. Mr. Blake quotes Sir Charles Morgan's remark that the Government of England "did not entertain the idea that the resources of Ireland could or ought to be made available for the Irish subject." He then goes on to say that against no branch of industry and enterprise were more determined, and unfortunately more successful, efforts directed than to crush the Irish fisheries so far as their prosecution by the people of the country.

"The Cromwellian parliament was inundated with petitions from several English fishing stations, praying that the fisheries of Ireland might be discouraged on account of the great injury the competition of Irish fishermen proved to the trade of the English fishermen abroad. The prayer was granted."

On land or on water it was all the same. The active, insatiable, incessant policy was to deprive the Irish of whatever benefit they could derive from the produce of their land, or of the sea that washed their coasts. Mr. Blake carries down his narrative to the present century.

While hostility to every profitable Irish industry was the leading principle of Government, successive Viceroys exhorted Parliament, in speeches from the throne, to "prevent the further growth of Popery," to give fresh force and efficiency to the penal laws, and to see that those laws were duly executed. Take, as a sample, the recommendation of the Duke of Grafton, when pro-

roguing Parliament, to keep a strict watch upon the Papists ; "since," says his Grace, "I have reason to believe that the number of Popish priests is daily increasing in this kingdom, and already far exceeds what by the indulgence of the law is allowed."

The Protestant primate of Ireland was, in Swift's time, Hugh Boulter. That prelate's voluminous correspondence displays the spirit which then actuated the leaders of the anti-Irish State Church. His prime anxiety is to promote the king's business in Ireland. Himself an Englishman, he earnestly recommends that Englishmen only should be appointed to the Irish bishoprics. The burthen of his letters consists of the necessity of excluding natives of Ireland from all the great offices of State, secular and ecclesiastical. He could not trust even Irish Protestants "to do the king's business," for in view of a probable vacancy in the see of Dublin, he writes :

I am entirely of opinion that the new archbishop ought to be an Englishman, either already on the bench here, or in England. As for a native of this country, I can hardly doubt that, whatever his behaviour has been or his promises may be, when he is once in that station he will put himself at the head of the Irish interest, in the Church at least, and he will naturally carry with him the college and most of the clergy here.

What Primate Boulter calls the Irish interest in the Church can only mean the appointment of native Protestant clergymen to good benefices. The State Church was an English, not an Irish, institution ; it was established here by English power, and established for the purpose of helping to stamp out Irish aspiring to national autonomy. It was fattened on the confiscation of the Irish ecclesiastical State revenues. It was a principal link in the chain that fettered Ireland to English domination ; and being so, its clergy could not reasonably be accused of any really national sentiments or intentions ; so that those of them who had been born in Ireland could have only incurred the suspicions of Primate Boulter from the place of their nativity. This primate, intensely hostile as he was to Ireland, had enormous power in the Government of the country. From 1724 to 1738 he held the archiepiscopal See of Armagh. During the occasional absences from Ireland of the Viceroy, the executive functions of his office are performed by Lords Justices. It gives us some idea of the political influence of Boulter to find that he filled the office of Lord Justice on thirteen occasions from 1726 to 1741.

While Swift was incumbent of Laracor he employed himself in enlarging the glebe, in forming a garden, and in constructing a canal, by the sides of which he planted willows. That the place became dear to him is evident from the frequent and affec-

tionate mention of it in his *Journal to Stella*. He also bought the tithes of Effernock, which, by his will, he settled on all future incumbents ; making, however, this very remarkable provision : that if, at any future time, the Established Church should be disendowed, the tithes he had purchased should be appropriated to the support of the parochial Christian poor of any denomination ; but excluding Jews, atheists, and infidels.

It was now that Stella, and a Mrs. Dingley who accompanied her from England, established themselves, or rather were established by Swift, in the neighbouring town of Trim, where they always resided while Swift occupied Laracor, only changing their abode to the vicarage on its owner's occasional journeys to England. Stella attracted the admiration of a Reverend Mr. Tisdall, whose breath is recorded by Swift, in a stinging epigram, to have been peculiarly offensive. This infragrant clergyman proposed marriage to her, and notwithstanding the annoying perfume he exhaled, the lady appears to have listened for some time to his addresses without any apparent reluctance ; although it is suggested by some of Swift's biographers that her acquiescence was perhaps assumed in order to ascertain Swift's real intentions in her regard. Swift managed to get rid of the divine of evil odour by insisting on a larger pecuniary provision for Stella, in the event of her widowhood, than the lover was able to grant ; and on this point the treaty was broken off.

Swift's time passed pleasantly between the society of the fascinating Stella in Ireland and annual visits to London. In 1704 he had printed his celebrated "Tale of a Tub," an allegory designed to exalt the Anglican Church at the expense of the Catholics on the one hand, and of the Presbyterians on the other. Through life he was an ardent High Churchman. The "Tale of a Tub," written in advocacy of English Protestantism, was, however, severely censured on the score of its irreverence by many divines of that communion. It is probable that Swift was not insensible of the justice of the censure. Yet he appears to think that the end justified the means, for he says to Stella : "They may talk of the—you know what" (meaning the book in question), "but if it had not been for that, I should never have been able to get the success I have had ; and if that helps me to succeed, then that same thing will be serviceable to the Church."\* Here he argues that if the talent displayed in an irreverent book should induce Queen Anne's Ministry to advance him in the Church, then that unclerical volume will have served the Church by procuring the promotion of her champion. Quite consistent with this sort of reasoning is his advocacy of the

\* "Journal to Stella," October, 1710.

Test Act, although he witnessed and records its demoralizing operation. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the Test Act was a statute which excluded from official employment all persons who did not profess the established religion, by requiring each servant of the Crown, from the highest to the lowest, to receive the sacrament in the State Church as a qualification for office. Swift wrote in defence of the Test Act, and yet he could satirize its operation thus:—"I was early with the Secretary to-day, but he was gone to his devotions, and to receive the sacrament ; several rakes did the same ; it was not for piety, but employments, according to Act of Parliament."\* He saw the profanation of a rite which he deemed holy, yet he defended the statute which rendered such profanation inevitable, because he considered that statute a useful bulwark of the Church Establishment. But it would not be just to pass an unqualified condemnation on Swift for this inconsistency. We must keep in mind that if he learned little else in Trinity College, he was likely, at least, to acquire in that seminary the most extreme principles with respect to the predominance of the Anglican Church, and the absolute right of her members to monopolize public employments. He lived at a time when the members of all Churches were ready to fence their theological dogmas with political enactments. He was a Churchman by choice, for he rejected the offer of a military commission from King William, and of a civil employment from Sir William Temple. At the period of life when the mind is "wax to receive and marble to retain," he associated with few, if any, who did not hold the strongest ascendancy doctrines. The nature of his education, the nature of the profession he adopted, the men with whom he mixed in social intercourse, all were calculated to confirm the original prejudices of a mind, remarkable indeed for its vigour and acuteness, but equally remarkable for the pertinacity of its partisanship in any cause dear to its affections.

Swift seems to occupy a place strangely anomalous, when he appears as the bold and zealous champion of the national right of Ireland to be governed by an Irish Parliament alone, and also as the champion of so essentially anti-national an institution as the State Church. But we heartily honour him for his eminent merits and services ; and we mark his failings only as they show how connection with an alien establishment can vitiate the mind and impair the consistency of even the greatest patriot.

In 1710 the Protestant bishops in Ireland associated Swift in a commission with their brother prelates of Ossory and Killaloe to proceed to London in order to solicit from Queen

\* "Journal to Stella," November 25, 1711.

Anne's Ministry a remission of the first-fruits and twentieth-parts payable to the Crown by the Protestant Establishment in Ireland. Swift entered with zealous alacrity on the duties of his mission. He sailed from Dunleary to Parkgate on the 1st of September.\* The voyage was performed in fifteen hours. He thence set forth for Chester, from which town the first portion of his memorable Journal to Stella is dated on the second of that month. He rode post from Chester to London. The journey occupied five days; he tells Stella he was weary the first day, almost dead the second, tolerable the third, and well enough the rest; and that on his arrival in London the Whigs were ravished to see him, and would lay hold on him as drowning men seize a twig. To this visit to London we owe what is incomparably more interesting than the question of the first-fruits (in which we may parenthetically say that Swift was successful), namely, the Journal to Stella, which reveals not only the general sentiments of the writer, but, with the most extraordinary minuteness, every passing caprice of his mind. The wandering shadows of thought are caught up and stereotyped by a process resembling photography. The Journal was obviously written in perfect confidence that it never would meet the public eye. No man who anticipated the slightest chance of future publication would have written down the fantastic jargon which familiarity with Stella had introduced into their confidential intercourse. Words are mis-spelled to imitate the imperfect utterance of infants. There are the vilest puns. There are snatches of *ex tempore* proverbs in rhyme. Some passages he wrote with his eyes shut. Much of the Journal was written in bed, and some parts he affects to have written when in the act of rising, and the movement out of bed on a frosty morning is apparently jotted down as it occurs.† Sometimes we have his dreams, sometimes we have a sportive malediction, which assuredly was not uttered *ex corde*. A letter to Stella and Mrs. Dingley on the 1st of April, begins with a grave *bounce*, immediately followed with the triumphant exclamation, "An April fool! An April fool! O ho! young women!" We have an imitation of the manner in which Chelsea buns are cried. We have an imitation of the inarticulate grunts forced from him by the coldness of the weather. These, and various other childish passages, would not have been written in a Journal which the author supposed should ever see the light. Their value is twofold: they

\* Or perhaps the 31st of August, on which day his credentials are dated.

† "Come, stand away, let me rise. Patrick, take away the candle. Is there a good fire? So—up adazy."—*Journal*, 31st January, 1711.

display the most secret caprices of a very remarkable mind; they also are guarantees that the graver traits of the writer developed in the *Journal* disclose his genuine character.

And what, let us ask, are those traits?

We find, in the first place, that Swift possessed, in a very high degree, the noble quality of fervid benevolence. He is constantly occupied in smoothing the asperities of life for the unfortunate, and in assisting merit in its struggles to rise. To befriend all who needed help was with him a labour of love. Of a young gentleman named Harrison he says:—"I love the young fellow, and am resolved to stir up people to do something for him; he is a Whig, and I will put him upon some of my east Whigs." He interested himself so actively for Harrison, that he got him appointed secretary to Lord Raby, Ambassador Extraordinary at the Hague; and when reporting his success to Stella, he says, with benevolent complacency, "An't I a good friend?" Some months subsequently, Swift, who had conceived a regard for the recipient of his kindness, was apprised that his young friend was ill, and wished to see him. The *Journal* accordingly contains the following entry:—"I went in the morning, and found him mighty ill, and got thirty guineas for him from Lord Bolingbroke, and an order for a hundred pounds from the Treasury, to be paid him to-morrow; and I have got him removed to Knightsbridge for the air. He has a fever, and inflammation of the lungs, but I hope will do well." This hope was, unhappily, fallacious; and the following notices, extracted from the *Journal* of the next two days, are so honourable to Swift's heart, and so illustrative of his character, that I cannot omit them:—

I am much concerned for this poor lad. His mother and sister attend him, and he wants nothing. . . . I took Parnell this morning and walked to see poor Harrison. I had the hundred pounds in my pocket. I told Parnell I was afraid to knock at the door: my mind misgave me as I knocked, and his man, in tears, told me his master was dead an hour before. Think what grief this is to me. I went to his mother, and have been ordering things for his funeral with as little cost as possible to-morrow, at ten at night. I could not dine with Lord Treasurer, nor anywhere else; but got a bit of meat toward evening. No loss ever grieved me so much; poor creature!

To record all the acts of kindness by which Swift showed that he *could* be a genuine friend, would exceed the due limits of this paper. They are mentioned in the *Journal* to Stella; but in communicating them to her there is not the least ostentation. That *Journal*, as I have already said, was never meant for publication. It was addressed in strict confidence to Stella and her companion. So far was Swift from the wretched vanity of wishing to parade his good qualities, that he actually erred in

the opposite direction, and was justly accused by Lord Bolingbroke of being far more apt to obtrude his failings on the public notice.

A pleasing trait revealed by the Journal is his fondness for his home at Laracor. He has scarcely reached London, when he says: "I protest I shall return to Dublin and the canal at Laracor with more satisfaction than I ever did in my life." He protests that he likes Laracor better than Prebendary Sartre's "delicious house and garden" at Westminster. Mixed with a thousand miscellaneous topics, the following aspirations occur in various parts of the Journal:—"I wish I were at Laracor." "I should be plaguy busy at Laracor if I were there now, cutting down willows, planting others, scouring my canal, and every kind of thing." "Oh, that we were at Laracor this fine day! The willows begin to peep, and the quicks to bud." Elsewhere he says the time he passed in England was mere "dirt" in comparison with the days of Laracor.

There are, indeed, many indications that notwithstanding this fondness for his Irish home, he would have gladly accepted preferment in England. And in a letter, written at a much later period from Dublin, he tells Pope that going to England is a very good thing if it were not attended with an ugly circumstance of returning to Ireland. The truth appears to be that the political condition of Ireland disgusted him. The system adopted by successive English administrations of governing this kingdom with an exclusive view to the benefit of England, kept his mind in a state of painful irritation, which was exasperated by residence in the island where the baleful effects of foreign tyranny perpetually met his observation. The destruction thus effected of our manufacturing industries necessarily threw the people on agriculture for subsistence. In this pursuit the Catholic farmers were hampered by the law that restrained them, under penalty of forfeiture to the Protestant discoverer, from improving their own interest in their farms beyond a certain specified part of the annual value. It is strange that Swift was silent on this penal enactment, when he could describe the condition of the farmers in such language as the following:—

Another great calamity [he says] is the exorbitant raising of the rent of lands. Upon the determination of leases made before the year 1690, a gentleman thinks he has indifferently improved his estate if he has only doubled his rent-roll. Farms are screwed up to a rack-rent; leases granted but for a small term of years; tenants tied down to hard conditions and discouraged from cultivating the lands they occupy to the best advantage by the certainty they have of the rent being raised on the expiration of their lease proportionably to the improvements they shall make. Thus it is that honest industry is

restrained ; the farmer is a slave to his landlord ; and it is well if he can cover his family with a coarse homespun frieze.\*

The *auri sacri fames* of the landlords was frequently associated with contemptuous hostility to the creed and the race of the farmers. The progress of time would have softened and finally extinguished the sectarian source of strife, if the Irish Parliament had not been wickedly abolished ; while commercial and manufacturing prosperity, unchecked by the Union, would have relieved the land of the surplus numbers who exceeded its capacity to feed them.

Swift's description of the rack-renting system might answer for our own day ; not indeed universally, for many Irish landlords are satisfied with fair and moderate rents ; but unhappily the rack-renting gentry are sufficiently numerous to taint the character of the institution of landlordism, and to furnish grounds more or less plausible for the agitation of the Land League.

Swift's talents procured for him during his sojourn in London the intimacy of the principal leaders in politics, fashion, and literature. His pen was actively engaged in the service of the Harley Ministry, who were glad to have the benefit of his powerful assistance. His services were freely tendered. He spurned the notion of pecuniary recompense, and when Harley sent him a bank-bill for fifty pounds in requital of his advocacy, Swift resented the offer as an insult. "I was in a rage," he says to Stella, "but my friend Lewis cooled me, and said it is what the best of men sometimes meet with ; and I have been not seldom served in the like manner, although not so grossly. In these cases I never demur for a moment, nor ever found the least inclination to take anything."

Although Swift rejected with angry scorn pecuniary payment for his labours, yet he naturally looked for professional promotion, which he found it extremely difficult to obtain. His great friends were enchanted with his company. They caressed him, they praised him, they invited him to their tables, they enrolled him in a select club, to which none were admissible who could not boast high rank or distinguished genius. They frequently gratified him by promoting the persons whom he recommended to their patronage ; but his own promotion seemed unattainable. An invisible power perpetually baffled his efforts to rise in his Church. When recording in his Journal that he had obtained an employment for Dr. Sacheverell's brother, he adds : "This is the seventh I have now provided for since I came, and I can do nothing for myself." The secret cause of his failure was that Queen Anne had read his "Tale of a Tub," and conceived an

---

\* "The Present Miserable State of Ireland."

inveterate dislike to the author on account of the levity with which theological questions appeared to be treated in that work. I do not defend the "Tale of a Tub." It is replete with most erroneous doctrine. But I am convinced that Swift, in writing it, had no more design to promote a general scepticism than other Anglican controversialists have had in their graver polemical treatises. To Swift's mind all subjects naturally presented themselves in a ludicrous light. He saw theology, just as he saw everything else, through a medium of humour; and he probably laughed at Lord Peter with as little intentional irreverence towards Christianity as Barrow felt when he compiled his accumulation of subtle plausibilities against the supremacy.

Although my principal object is to show the condition of Ireland in Swift's time, and his connection with Irish political events, yet I cannot refrain from shortly referring to the memorable instance in which he displayed the power of his genius in changing the public opinion of England on a most momentous question. Parliament was engrossed with the question of peace or war. Peace was intensely unpopular. The military glories of Marlborough had created a strong feeling through England in favour of continuing a war in which successive victories exalted the national renown and flattered the national vanity. On the other hand, the Harley administration was committed to the policy of peace. To render peace popular was the task assigned to Swift, and his performance of that task was a wondrous intellectual triumph. In November, 1711, he published a pamphlet entitled "The Conduct of the Allies," of which four editions were exhausted in a week. The effect of that pamphlet on the public mind was miraculous. It dissected the political condition of Europe. Tearing aside the veil which the vanity of the English nation, elate with the conquests of their General, had drawn over their eyes, Swift displayed the enormous expenditure of English wealth to secure the Dutch, or increase the power of the Emperor, without any advantage to England; and he showed how doubtful, how precarious, was the friendship of some of the allies for whose benefit English treasure had been lavishly squandered. The nation read, and were convinced. Public opinion became as eager for peace as it had been for war. In the House of Commons Swift's arguments were adopted by the Ministry and their friends, and triumphantly urged against the Whigs. Thus, in a most momentous crisis, did an Irish parson, undistinguished by aristocratic connection, by large fortune, or by anything except the power and brilliancy of his genius, sway the destinies of England, and enable the Harley administration to effect the peace of Utrecht. Swift's intellectual position was now magnificent. By the sole force of mind he had produced a

revolution in the national opinion fraught with the deepest importance to England and to Europe. He was the idol of the Tories. His company was sought by the leading men of all parties in the world of politics and the world of literature. With some of these he formed friendships that lasted through life. With others, among whom were Addison and Steele, private friendship was afterwards broken off by political disagreement.

He had kept a Ministry in office. He associated on terms of proud personal independence and strict equality with the magnates of the land: his great and varied mental powers, which could dictate the policy of a nation or unbend in sparkling epigrams and playful witticisms, were the theme of universal admiration. Yet Swift, the statesman, the satirist, the poet, was still unable to obtain ecclesiastical preferment. His chagrin breaks out in his *Journal*. “I have been,” he tells Stella, “used barbarously by the late Ministry. I am a little piqued in honour to let people see I am not to be despised. The assurances they give me, without any scruple or provocation, are such as are usually believed in the world; but the first opportunity that is neglected, I shall depend no more, but come away.”\* Again, we read: “I dined with the Lord Treasurer, who chid me for being absent three days. Mighty kind! less of civility and more of interest.”†

I shall pass briefly over the episode of Swift’s affair with Esther Vanhomrigh. When in London he became acquainted with her family. The father of Esther had been one of King William’s commissioners during the Irish civil wars, and he contrived, from that and some other employments, to amass £12,000, with which he purchased certain forfeited estates in Ireland. Esther had literary taste, and Swift, who was always accessible to the claims of his friends for intellectual or literary aid, readily gave her the benefit of his abilities and information. Their intercourse inspired the young lady with a violent passion for the Dean, which he did not reciprocate. He had formed a resolution that he would not marry *before* his pecuniary means should, in his opinion, render marriage prudent; nor *after* he had passed the age when he might reasonably hope to establish his offspring in the world. He seems to have dreaded the expense of a family. Speaking of the prolific helpmate of a Parson Raymond, he exclaims, “Will Mrs. Raymond never have done lying in? He intends to leave beggars enough.”‡ Writing to Pope about his need of exercise and change of air,§ he says, “I often ride a dozen miles, but I come to my own bed at night.

\* “*Journal*,” 5th April, 1711. † *Ibid*, 26th December, 1712.

‡ *Ibid*, 9th October, 1712. § 31st October, 1735.

My best way would be to marry ; for in that case any bed would be better than my own." In his "Thoughts on Various Subjects," he tells us that "Matrimony has many children : Repentance, Discord, Poverty, Jealousy, Sickness, Spleen, and Loathing." And in his "Thoughts on Religion," he says: "No wise man ever married from the dictates of reason." Miss Esther Vanhomrigh was unfortunate in fixing her affections on this fascinating celebist.

Meanwhile Swift, after many delays and disappointments, was given the Deanery of St. Patrick's in 1713. He thus describes his Dublin establishment :—

I live in the corner of a vast unfurnished house ; my family consists of a steward, a groom, a helper in the stable, a footman, and an old maid, who are all at board wages ; and when I do not dine abroad, or make an entertainment (which last is very rare), I eat a mutton pie and drink half a pint of wine. My amusements are, defending my small dominions against the archbishop, and endeavouring to reduce my rebellious choir. *Perditur hæc inter misero lux.*"\*

But—worse than archiepiscopal encroachments—more terrible than choral insubordination—perplexities now menaced Swift's peace from female jealousy and rivalry. Miss Vanhomrigh had pursued him to Ireland. He remonstrated with her on the folly of indulging a passion which it was not in his power to return. But his coldness gave her so much agony that he found it impossible to break off their intercourse, unless at the hazard of a fatal result. Her condition excited his pity, and he treated her with compassionate kindness. Stella now became jealous, and her health sank under the agitation of her spirits. Swift's predicament was pitiable. He loved Stella with the fondest fraternal affection. His regard for Vanessa, as he chose to designate Miss Vanhomrigh, he describes as that of a master for a favourite pupil, or of a father for his child. He expressly declares that for neither lady had he experienced the sentiments of a lover. It is plain, from his published correspondence with Vanessa, that he tried to make her get rid of her romantic attachment. But in vain. The enthusiasm of her passion found vent in expressions of almost incredible extravagance.

Stella and Vanessa each wanted to monopolize his affections ; and not only health, but even life, seemed in both cases imperilled by the contention. At last Vanessa, suspecting that Swift might have privately married her rival, wrote a letter to Stella inquiring into that delicate subject. Stella handed the letter to the Dean, who, exasperated at Vanessa's pertinacity, immediately rode to her residence, Marlay Abbey, Celbridge.

\* Letter to Pope, 28th June, 1715.

Entering the apartment where she sat, he angrily flung a sealed packet on the table, and departed without uttering a word. Poor Vanessa, on opening the packet, found only her own letter to Stella. She survived the shock but a few weeks. On her death, Swift, in an agony of grief and remorse, retired to the south of Ireland, where for two months he secluded himself from all society. No person knew the place of his retreat.

On his return to Dublin his spirits gradually revived under the influence of professional occupation, and of the company of Sheridan, Delany, Helsham, and other intimate friends, some of whom were qualified by wit and talent to enter on a rivalry of comic poems, puns, epigrams and repartee. Stella, whose health had much improved, played her part with applause in these contests.

Swift now approached the time when he was to take an active part in the politics of his country, as the earnest friend of Ireland's commercial interests, and the able champion of her constitutional independence.

The reader will remember the legislative destruction of the Irish woollen trade by an English statute in 1698. The trade, which was steadily expanding, was computed to be worth about a million a year, and, as I have already said, many of the staplers whose natural rights were thus audaciously invaded by a foreign legislature, tried to indemnify themselves by a smuggling trade with France. But the nation languished under the blow that had been struck, and Swift felt the prostrate condition of his country with poignant grief and indignation. In one of his tracts he affirms that the woollen manufacture of this kingdom sat always nearest his heart. In his personal intercourse with friends, and in his private correspondence, the indomitable hatred of oppression that burned within him is perpetually manifested. To Delany he said: "Do not the corruptions and villanies of men eat your flesh and exhaust your spirits?" Delany quietly replied that they did not. "Why, how can you help it?" rejoined Swift, in a rage at his friend's tameness. Pope, in one of his letters, reproaches Swift with his "continual deplores of Ireland." At a later period Swift writes to Pope: "This kingdom is now absolutely starving by the means of every oppression that can be inflicted on mankind. 'Shall I not visit for these things?' saith the Lord. You advise me right, not to trouble myself about the world. But oppression tortures me." Again, in a letter to Mr. Benjamin Motte, the London printer, Swift writes:—

I am so incensed against the oppressions from England, and have so little regard to the laws they make, that I do, as a clergyman, encourage the merchants (of Ireland) both to export wool and woollen

manufactures to any country in Europe, or anywhere else, and conceal it from the Custom-house officers, as I would hide my purse from a highwayman if he came to rob me on the road, although England hath made a law to the contrary.

In 1720 he published “A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture in Clothes and Furniture; utterly Rejecting and Renouncing everything Wearable that comes from England.” So criminal did this proposal for the exclusive use of native manufacture appear to the Government, that the printer was prosecuted. Lord Chief Justice Whitshed, who presided at the trial, endeavoured to influence the jurors by affirming, with his hand on his breast, that the author’s design was to bring in the Pretender. But the device was ineffectual. The jurors found a verdict of Not Guilty. Whitshed sent them back nine times to reconsider their verdict, and detained them eleven hours. But in vain. The jurors persevered; and the trial of the verdict was postponed from term to term, until, on the arrival of the Duke of Grafton as Viceroy, his Grace, having naturally considered the matter, and probably seeing little wisdom in encountering the universal odium inseparable from further proceedings in so unpopular a cause, was pleased at last to grant a *nolle prosequi*.

In 1724 Swift wrote the celebrated “Drapier’s Letters.” The occasion was this: In 1723 King George I. had granted to an English hardware man, named William Wood, a patent empowering him to coin £108,000 in halfpence and farthings for circulation in Ireland, where a scarcity of copper coinage was stated to exist. There was a strong constitutional objection to this patent. The Irish Parliament had not been consulted; neither had the Viceroy nor the Privy Council. That a private tradesman, who, moreover, was an English and not an Irish subject of the Crown, should be invested with the privilege of coining the money of the realm without the sanction of the Irish Legislature, was properly deemed an unconstitutional invasion of the liberties of Ireland. But such was the depressed condition of the public mind that it would have probably been useless to oppose the project at first upon this ground.

The penal code was then in full vigour. It is true that it professed to persecute Catholics only. But, as naturally happens when the small minority of a nation are set upon the necks of the great majority, the Irish Protestants, who were legally constituted oppressors of their Catholic countrymen, became, with few exceptions, servile to the external power that enabled them to tyrannize at home. Yet there were occasional efforts to recalcitrate. In 1719, the Irish House of Lords asserted its independence in the memorable case of Sherlock and Annesley. The

latter had obtained a decree in the Court of Exchequer, which the Irish House of Lords reserved on appeal. Against their decision Annesley appealed to the English House of Lords, who confirmed the judgment of the Irish Exchequer by usurping the power of appellate jurisdiction in an Irish case. The Irish Lords presented an able State paper to the king, setting forth the legislative rights of Ireland, and their own independent jurisdiction within their own country. I do not pretend even to summarize the controversy, and shall merely say that, as England was strong and Ireland weak, it ended for the time in the passing of an English Act, the 6th of George I., declaring that the English Parliament had of right full power and authority to bind the people of the kingdom of Ireland by its statutes. The spirit that animated the Irish Lords, although temporarily unsuccessful, produced results of great importance at a later period. But just then superior power was triumphant, and the Irish Protestants generally continued to be the mere bond-slaves of England. The slight remains of independent feeling that yet lingered among them were chiefly visible in the useful resistance which the Irish House of Commons often made to English dictation in our money-bills.

Such was the condition of Ireland: the Catholics prostrate and proscribed; the Protestants placed by law in a position resembling that of jailers of the Catholics; the principles of constitutional liberty nearly effaced from men's minds by the legal division of the people into tyrants and slaves; the spirit of manly resistance to oppression, not indeed extinct, but at least for the greater part in helpless abeyance; manufactures laid prostrate by adverse legislation.

It appeared to Swift that the unconstitutional grant of a patent to Wood for the coinage of Irish halfpence might be taken advantage of to awaken his countrymen from the sleep of their bondage. A report arose that the new halfpence were much adulterated. Swift adopted this belief, and in a letter to the Irish people, signed "M. B., Drapier," aroused their fears of universal ruin if Wood's base coin should become current among them. He assured them that the adulteration of the copper had been carried to so great an extent that those who accepted it in payment of goods would lose elevenpence in every shilling. He admitted that the king had an undoubted right to grant the patent. But he demonstrated that the public had a right, equally undoubted, to reject the halfpence.

Therefore, my friends [he says], stand to it one and all: refuse this filthy trash. It is no treason to rebel against Mr. Wood. His Majesty, in his patent, obliges nobody to take these halfpence; our gracious prince has no such ill-advisers about him; or, if he had, yet

you see that the laws have not left it in the king's power to force us to take any coin but what is lawful, of right standard, gold or silver. Therefore you have nothing to fear. . . . In short, the halfpence are like "the accursed thing," which, as the Scripture tells us, "the children of Israel were forbidden to touch." They will run about like the plague, and destroy every one who lays his hand on them.

A tremendous panic was created. Sir Robert Walpole, the Prime Minister, was greatly perplexed. The profits of Wood's patent were to be secretly divided with one of the ladies of light character who had accompanied the king from Hanover, whom his Majesty had created Duchess of Kendal, and whom he had graciously quartered on the Irish pension list; and Walpole had to choose between displeasing the king's greedy and powerful mistress and driving Irish discontent into insurrection. With the view of quieting the fears of the Irish, he caused an assay to be made of the halfpence at the Mint in the Tower; and a report was issued by Sir Isaac Newton, asserting that the coin was in every respect of equal value with the current copper coinage of England. Swift laughed scornfully at the report:—

How impudent [he exclaimed] and insupportable is this! Wood takes care to coin a dozen or two halfpence of good metal, sends them to the Tower, and they are approved; and these must answer all that he has already coined, or shall coin for the future. . . . I have heard of a man who had a mind to sell his house, and therefore carried a piece of a brick in his pocket, which he showed as a pattern to encourage purchasers; and this is directly the case in point with Mr. Wood's assay.

Swift sustained the opposition to Wood, not only with the "Drapier's Letters," but with many minor publications in prose and rhyme of inimitable humour and sarcasm. His broadsides and ballads quickly spread through the nation, and the ferment hourly increased. In the first three letters the Drapier had dwelt chiefly on the question of the patent, and on the disastrous results of circulating an enormous amount of base coin.\* But in the fourth letter, addressed "To the Whole People of Ireland," he places the question on the high ground of constitutional right, and denies the power of the English Government to make Ireland submit to a contract to which the Irish Legislature was not a party.

A people [he tells his countrymen] long used to hardships lose by degrees the very notions of liberty. They look upon themselves as creatures at mercy, and that all impositions laid on them by a

---

\* Whether the halfpence were generally adulterated has been much disputed. Swift affirms that he saw a large quantity of them weighed by a very skilful person, and that they were light.

stronger hand, are, in the phrase of the report, legal and obligatory. Hence proceed that poverty and lowness of spirit to which a kingdom may be subject as well as a particular person.

He combats the slavish notion that Ireland is a dependent kingdom :—

A dependent kingdom is a modern term of art, unknown, as I have heard, to all ancient civilians and writers upon government; and Ireland is, on the contrary, called in some statutes "an imperial Crown," as held only from God, which is as high a style as any kingdom is capable of receiving. . . . I have looked over all the English and Irish statutes without finding any law that makes Ireland depend upon England any more than England does upon Ireland. We have, indeed, obliged ourselves to have the same king with them; and consequently they are obliged to have the same king with us.

He plainly declared that he owed allegiance to the king, not as king of England, but as king of Ireland. He dealt with the claim of Irish constitutional independence, and the encroachments of English usurpation, as a question of Right against Might. "In *reason*," he said, "all government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery; but, in *fact*, eleven men well armed will certainly subdue one single man in his shirt."

The doctrine of Irish legislative independence is as old as the connection of the two countries. Lord Macaulay talks of the just exercise of that supremacy which, in his opinion, the English Legislature then possessed over a dependent kingdom. He ought rather to have styled it the exercise of that lawless and intrusive power which the stronger nation, without the slightest foundation of justice, usurped over the weaker. Sir Walter Scott, in his admirable "Memoirs of Swift," quotes, as incompatible with the aggressions of the English Parliament on the constitutional sovereignty of Ireland, the English maxim adopted in the reign of Richard the Third : "Ireland has her Parliament, and enacts laws; and our [English] statutes do not bind them, because they send not representatives to [our] Parliament."\*

It is true that there had been occasional aggressions by England on the authority of the Irish Parliament. But these were usurpations. They were the encroachments of Might upon Right. The just title of Ireland to legislative sovereignty, though held in abeyance by superior power, still survived, and was ready to reassert itself whenever the external pressure should be removed or relaxed.

\* "Life" prefixed to Scott's edition of Swift, second edition, p. 284, note : "Hibernia habet parliamentum, et faciunt leges; et nostra statuta non ligant eos, quia non mittunt milites ad parliamentum."

Swift's patriotic agitation excited the horror and alarm of the Protestant Primate, Dr. Boulter, who complains in one of his letters that the outcry against Wood threatened to terminate those unhappy divisions of Irishmen from which England then, as subsequently, derived so much illicit advantage. Boulter complained that Swift's agitation tended to unite Protestant with Papist; intimating that if such a junction should occur, it would be all over with the English interest in Ireland.

Meanwhile Wood, confident in royal and ministerial patronage, arrogantly boasted of the steps by which, he said, persons in power would secure his triumph over Irish opposition. Swift treated his boasts with utter scorn, calling them "the last howls of a dog dissected alive;" and concluded a spirited exhortation to his countrymen to persevere, in these words: "The remedy is wholly in your own hands, and therefore I have digressed a little in order to refresh and continue that spirit so seasonably raised among you, and to let you see that by the laws of God, of nations, and of your country, you are, and ought to be, as free a people as your brethren in England."

No wonder that Boulter should regard Swift with intense dislike. On one of Swift's visits to London, the Primate wrote to caution Sir Robert Walpole against placing faith in any statement he might make.

Harding, Swift's printer, was imprisoned, and a Crown prosecution was instituted against him. Swift addressed seasonable advice to the grand jury. He published some telling verses, enforcing the duty of acquitting the accused. A Quaker plied the public with a verse from the Bible: "And the people said unto Saul, Shall Jonathan die, who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel? God forbid! As the Lord liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground; for he hath wrought with God this day. So the people rescued Jonathan that he died not."\*

The jury, thus exhorted in prose and poetry, refused to find the bill against Harding, although Chief Justice Whitshed exerted all his influence to procure a conviction. Walpole, seeing the dangerous temper of the Irish nation, yielded at length to the storm raised by Swift. Wood was driven from the field, and the grand constitutional doctrines, which the Drapier had brought prominently forward, sank deep into the public mind. It is said that when Walpole once talked of having Swift arrested, he was checked by a friend who asked whether he could spare ten thousand men to achieve such a perilous enterprise.

The Dean's popularity was now unbounded. He seems to have had a cynical dislike to public plaudits; for being greeted

---

\* 1 Sam. xiv. 45.

in the streets of Dublin with the vociferous acclamations of the grateful multitude, he is said to have exclaimed: "Plague take the fools! how much joy would all this bawling give my lord mayor!" And on his triumph over Wood and the English Government, he retired for awhile to Quilea, a secluded country house in the county Meath, belonging to his friend Sheridan.

Swift published, subsequently to the Drapier controversy, some short tracts on Irish politics. In one of these, entitled "A Short View of the State of Ireland,"\* he enumerates fourteen causes of national prosperity, of which modern readers will be especially interested in the following:—

The sixth is, by being governed only by laws made with their own consent; for otherwise they are not a free people.† And therefore all appeals or applications for favour or preferment to another country are so many grievous impoverishments.

The eleventh is, when the rents of land and the profits of employment are spent in the country that produced them, and not in another; the former of which will certainly happen where the love of our native land prevails.

The twelfth is, by the public revenues being all spent and employed at home, except on the occasion of a foreign war.

In the days of Swift absenteeism existed to a considerable extent, although it had not reached to anything like the prevalence to which the Union has carried it in modern times. The larger proportion of the absentees in the reigns of George I. and George II., consisted of the English families who had grants of the estates confiscated in Ireland by William III. But a rental of £627,799 was, according to the estimate of Thomas Prior in 1729, annually withdrawn from the country, and the drain was severely felt. Yet it should be noted that, notwithstanding this drawback on the national prosperity, notwithstanding also the injury sustained by Ireland from embargoes on her commerce, and the damaging restriction of Irish constitutional liberty by English usurpation, many noble mansions were erected in different parts of the kingdom by resident proprietors. The nobility clustered in the metropolis, in which they built stately residences. The ducal palace of the Leinster family in Kildare Street, and the spacious mansion of the Earls of Tyrone, in Marlborough Street, were built about 1740. Near the same period was built, at a cost of probably £100,000, the princely residence of the Conollys, at Castletown, in the county Kildare. Dangan, the abode of Lord Mornington, in the county Meath, is described as a mansion

\* In 1727.

† The union with England is a law made and continued against the consent of the Irish nation, and is therefore, according to Swift, subversive of their freedom.

of great splendour in 1732, by Mrs. Pendarves, a guest at that period of the noble owner. Many other costly houses were erected during the earlier half of the century. The erection of such mansions was a sign of life which should not be forgotten in a description, however brief, of the state of the kingdom in those days.

Lord Macaulay is careful to record the disparaging manner in which Swift sometimes names the aboriginal population of Ireland. But his lordship takes care *not* to tell his readers the mode in which Swift accounts for the depression of the Irish people. Among Swift's friends was Sir Charles Wogan, an officer in the Spanish service, descended from an ancient Irish Catholic family. In a letter addressed in July, 1732, by Swift to Sir Charles, we find the following estimate of the Irish Catholics abroad and at home :—

I cannot [says the Dean] but highly esteem those gentlemen of Ireland who, with all the disadvantages of being exiles and strangers, have been able to distinguish themselves by their valour and conduct in so many parts of Europe, I think above all other nations; which ought to make the English ashamed of the reproaches they cast on the ignorance, the dulness, and the want of courage in the Irish natives; those defects, wherever they happen, arising only from the poverty and slavery they suffer from their inhuman neighbours, and the base, corrupt spirits of too many of the chief gentry.

The baseness and corruption of the chief gentry consisted in their slavish readiness to support what was termed the English interest, at the expense of their own countrymen. The same evil spirit survives in too many of their modern successors, who are likely to pay a terrible penalty for their anti-national offences.

In 1726 Swift published "Gulliver's Travels." That inimitable work is a threefold satire. It burlesques the proverbial mendacity of travellers. It satirizes human nature in general, and the English administrative system in particular, with exquisite pungency; we see throughout the book, especially in the author's account of the Courts of *Liliput* and *Laputa*, the impression produced on his mind by his personal experience :—

I have known Courts [he tells Gay in 1727] these thirty-six years, and know they differ; but in some things they are extremely constant: First, in the trite old maxim of a Minister's never forgiving those he hath injured; secondly, in the insincerity of those who would be thought the best friends; thirdly, in the love of fawning, cringing, and tale-bearing; fourthly, in sacrificing those whom we really wish well to a point of interest or intrigue; fifthly, in keeping everything worth taking, for those who can do service or disservice.

Swift had gone to England in 1726, but was recalled by the

afflicting intelligence that his beloved friend Stella was dangerously ill. In the August of that year he returned to Dublin, and found that she had partially recovered, but her recovery was little more than a reprieve. She died on the 28th of January, 1728, to the inexpressible grief of the Dean. Her remains were interred in St. Patrick's Cathedral. Swift wrote a character of Stella, in which he takes care to record her attachment to Ireland. He says: "She detested the tyranny and injustice of England in the treatment of this kingdom."

Swift's thoughts had long been occupied with death; it was the frequent subject of his meditations. "I was," he tells Lord Bolingbroke in 1729, "forty-seven years old when I began to think of death; and the reflections upon it now begin when I wake in the morning, and end when I am going to sleep." To Pope he says, in 1737, "When I was of your age I thought every day of death, but now every minute." With the solemn contemplations evoked by the prospect of his decease were mingled characteristic imaginings of comic humour. One of his most laughable performances is a poem written on his own death, which he supposes to be communicated to some of his friends when engaged at a card-table, and whose alternate remarks on the defunct Dean and on the points of the game, illustrate, with keen satire, Swift's estimate of their friendship and of the insincerity of their sorrow.

Swift has been accused of avarice. He was extremely economical, and his early penury had given him habits of thrift which he retained through life. But he acted on his own maxim, that "a wise man should have money in his head, but not in his heart." His thrift did not restrain him from performing many acts of generosity, of which some are recorded by his biographers, while it is probable that many others found no record in this world; for a hatred of ostentation was one of his characteristics.

He has been accused of infidelity. The charge is equally stupid and malicious. It is certain that he regularly practised his private devotions. He introduced public services on Wednesdays and Fridays in his church at Laracor: thus performing a gratuitous task which undoubtedly infers a strong sense of religious obligation. The charge against him rests on the levities mingled with his theological speculations—levities which are indeed indefensible, but which we must in candour refer to his all-pervading sense of comic humour—not to unbelief in Christianity. There is one strong piece of evidence that Swift was no infidel, in the remarkable fact that his deistical friend, Lord Bolingbroke, deemed it expedient to adopt, in writing to the Dean, the tone of a believer in Christianity. In Bolingbroke's

letter to Swift, dated 12th of September, 1724, that accomplished infidel says that the truth of the divine revelation of Christianity is as evident as matter of fact ought to be; and, he adds, "I make no doubt but you are by this time abundantly convinced of my orthodoxy, and that you will name me no more in the same breath with Spinoza, whose system of one infinite substance I despise and abhor, as I have a right to do, because I am able to show why I despise and abhor it." Now, this letter of Bolingbroke's shows two things: the first, that Swift, whom he knew long and intimately, had always appeared to him to believe in the Christian revelation; for assuredly he otherwise never would have attempted to pass himself off on the Dean as a Christian. The second, that Swift, not satisfied with simply professing Christianity, had attacked the infidel notions of Bolingbroke, whom it clearly appears he had compared to Spinoza. It is certain that if Swift had been an infidel, Bolingbroke would, of all men, have been the most likely to be aware of his infidelity. It is equally certain that Bolingbroke considered him to be a Christian.

As years advanced, his faculties gradually yielded to grief, disease, and age. In 1735 he writes to Pope a letter, in which the record of his personal infirmity is associated the *sæva indignatio* at the misgovernment of Ireland which never was absent from his mind: "Now I must tell you that you are to look on me as one going very fast out of the world; but my flesh and bones are to be carried to Holyhead, for I will not lie in a country of slaves."

And in 1737 he pathetically writes to the same friend: "I am now daily expecting an end of life. I have lost all spirit and every scrap of health. I sometimes recover a little of my hearing, but my head is ever out of order." And in the following year he addresses to Pope a mournful account of his physical and mental decay: "I desire you will look on me as a man worn with years, and sunk by public as well as personal vexations. I have entirely lost my memory; incapable of conversation by a cruel deafness which has lasted almost a year, and I despair of any cure."

In May, 1740, Swift made his will, by which he bequeathed his property to establish a lunatic asylum in Dublin. It is painful to record that for nearly two years before his death he had sunk into the mental condition of the unhappy persons for whom his benevolence had provided that receptacle. He died on the 19th of October, 1745. His remains were interred near those of Stella in St. Patrick's Cathedral, and on a mural tablet the following epitaph, composed by himself, records his hatred of tyranny, and his patriotic labours:—

Hic depositum est Corpus  
JONATHAN SWIFT, S.T.P.,  
Hujus Ecclesiae Cathedralis  
Decani  
Ubi sœva indignatio  
Ulterius cor lacerare nequit.  
Abi, Viator,  
Et imitare, si poteris,  
Strenuum pro virili libertatis vindicem.  
Obiit Anno 1745.  
Mensis Octobris die 19.  
Ætatis anno 78.

In considering the character of Swift as an Irish patriot, we must take into account his position as a dignitary of the anti-Irish State Church. He tells us that in his opinion every State should establish one State religion, and at most only tolerate others.\* Holding this opinion, it is natural that he deemed that the Church to which he belonged was the one Church entitled to the very questionable benefit of establishment. While the force of his patriotism was necessarily modified by his professional prejudices, it redounds to his glory that he should, notwithstanding those prejudices, have boldly vindicated the constitutional independence of his country. By birth and education he belonged to the dominant Protestant caste, by whom the penal laws against Catholics were enacted and sustained. He mixed much with men by whom the Catholic religion was held in horror, or contempt, or both. His own theological convictions were Anglican. He was zealous for the interests of the Protestant Establishment. His profession placed him under a sort of official necessity to say hard things now and then of Catholicity; yet his zeal had nothing in common with the modern system called Souperism. He complains to Stella of being "plagued with one Richardson, an Irish parson," who wanted to proselytize the Catholics; and although he expresses his desire to please the archbishop, yet he exclaims, "What business have I to meddle?" To an English Catholic lady, Mrs. Martha Blount, whom he invited to visit him at his deanery, he holds out the following inducement: "You shall have Catholicity as much as you please; and the Catholic Dean of St. Patrick's, as old again as I, for your confessor."†

To Swift's connection with the exotic Church Establishment we must ascribe the invidious distinction he occasionally makes between the Irish of Milesian descent and the Irish of English descent. Sometimes he claims for the latter the title of Englishmen. Lord Macaulay asserts that to the best of his belief Swift

\* Letter to Pope, February 7, 1736.

† February 29, 1728.

never bestowed the name of Irishmen on the natives of Ireland of English descent.\* This is a great mistake, which Macaulay could have easily corrected by perusing Swift's Journal to Stella. Not to speak of his subscribing himself "Hibernicus" in one of the letters on the Wood controversy, he repeatedly used the words "Irish" and "Irishmen"† to designate Irish Protestants of English lineage. He did, it is true, draw a line between the two races; and Sir Walter Scott considers that the prejudice thus indicated is partly to be accounted for by his situation as a dignitary of the Protestant Church.

When we reflect that Swift held high rank in that Church, and, moreover, that he was its hearty, zealous partisan, our admiration of his powerful and fearless struggles for Irish constitutional independence is increased in proportion to our knowledge of the countervailing influences to which his position exposed him. It is much to be deplored that he was not a layman. Unencumbered with his gown, his hatred of oppression would have taken a wider range. He would perhaps have thundered against the penal laws with as much force as against Wood's patent to coin halfpence. Had he sat in the Irish House of Commons, his commanding genius and warm love of freedom would have infused health and vigour into that assembly. But his professional exigencies narrowed the channel through which the current of his patriotism flowed.

The composition in which Swift's love of Ireland appears most racy of the soil, and most free from the sectarian and colonial taint that marks much of his hostility to England, is, probably, his poem on the sudden drying up of St. Patrick's Well, near Trinity College. He supposes St. Patrick, the patron of the fountain, thus to address Ireland:—

\* "History of England," chap. xvii. note.

† "I attended the Duke of Ormond with about fifty other *Irish* gentlemen at Skinners' Hall." One of the fifty was Sir Richard Levinge.—"Journal," Nov. 12, 1710. "I dined with Phil Savage and his *Irish* Club."—*Ibid.*, Dec. 12, 1710. "I dined with three *Irishmen* at one Mr. Cope's lodgings; the other two were one Morris, an archdeacon, and Mr. Ford."—*Ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1711. "I dined to-day at Ned Southwell's, with the Bishop of Ossory and a parcel of *Irish* gentlemen."—*Ibid.*, March 24, 1711. [At Southwell's] "All the *Irish* in town were there."—*Ibid.*, April 6, 1711. "Unexpectedly there dined with us an *Irish* knight, Sir John St. Leger."—*Ibid.*, Nov. 26, 1711. "I dined with Lord Anglesey to-day, who had seven *Irishmen* to be my companions, of which two only were coxcombs. One I did not know, and the other was young Bligh."—*Ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1712. "I hoise up Parnell, partly to spite the *Irish* folks here, particularly Tom Leigh."—*Ibid.*, Dec. 18, 1712. "I had a rabble of *Irish* parsons this morning drinking my chocolate."—*Ibid.*, March 13, 1713. Elsewhere he calls Steele Irish; and in the seventh "Drapier's Letter" he styles England "a foreign country." Of the numerous persons whom he designates as Irish in his Journal, it is probable that ninety-nine out of a hundred were Irish Protestants of English descent.

From thee with pride the Caledonians trace  
The glorious founder of their kingly race.  
Thy martial sons, whom now they dare despise,  
Did once their land subdue and civilize ;  
Their dress, their language, and the Scottish name,  
Confess the soil from whence the victors came.  
Well may they boast the ancient blood that runs  
Within their veins, who are thy younger sons ;  
A conquest and a colony from thee  
The mother kingdom left her children free.  
From thee no mark of slavery they felt ;  
Not so with thee thy base invaders dealt.  
Invited here to vengeful Murrough's aid,  
Those whom they could not conquer they betrayed.  
Britain ! by thee we fell, ungrateful isle,  
Not by thy valour, but superior guile.  
Britain ! with shame confess this land of mine,  
First taught thee knowledge, human and divine.  
My prelates and my students sent from hence,  
Made your sons converts both to God and sense.  
Not like the pastors of thy ravenous breed,  
Who come to fleece the flocks, and not to feed.

A few lines farther on the fleecing prelates sent hither by England are compared to magpies. St. Patrick still speaks :—

With omens oft I tried to warn their swains,  
Omens, the types of thy impending chains.  
I sent the magpie from the British soil  
With restless beak thy blooming fruit to spoil ;  
To din thine ears with unharmonious clack,  
And haunt thy holy walls in white and black.  
What else are those thou seest in bishop's gear,  
Who crop the nurseries of learning here ?  
Aspiring, greedy, full of senseless prate,  
Devour the Church, and chatter to the State !

Our indignant Patron Saint exclaims—

Oh ! had I been apostle to the Swiss,  
Or hardy Scot, or any land but this,  
Combined in arms they had their foes defied,  
And kept their liberty or bravely died ;  
Thou still with tyrants in succession curst,  
The last invaders trampling on the first ;  
Nor fondly hope for some reverse of fate,  
Virtue herself would now return too late.

Noble and patriotic sentences these—true utterances of that *sæva indignatio* to which Swift lays claim in his epitaph. It is very instructive to observe how the man who could utter such sentiments was hampered in the exercise of his patriotism by his connection with the anti-national State Church. There was a

struggle in his mind between the Anglican Protestant and the Irish patriot. He could proudly celebrate the ancient historical glories of his native land ; yet he would not emancipate the vast majority of his countrymen from penal shackles. He could battle nobly for the parliamentary independence of Ireland ; yet he would restrict to the members of his own Church the full enjoyment of that independence. He would perpetuate the Test Act. He compared the Catholic to a chained lion, and he had no desire that the chain should be broken. He compared the Presbyterians to a wild cat, ferocious and untamable. I may here observe that, while he opposed the admission of both Catholics and Presbyterians to political privileges, he clearly intimated that of the two the Catholics could show a better claim to be enfranchised. Of the Presbyterians he spoke with virulent scorn. He styled them vermin, and contemptuously rejected their pretensions to be called Brother Protestants. His patriotism certainly regarded in the first instance the aggrandisement of his own fellow-religionists ; although he was heartily anxious that the commercial benefits he sought for Ireland should be enjoyed by all her inhabitants without religious distinction.

Yet, despite all drawbacks, we regard our Dean with pride, with gratitude, and with affection. His faults as a politician were incident to his position ; his virtues and his public spirit were his own. His genius conferred honour upon Ireland. His patriotic activity served her. Gifted with brilliant and original powers of mind, and—to use his own words—"tortured with the oppression" under which his country groaned, Swift well deserves a statue in that classic hall\* where the forms of Lucas, Grattan, and O'Connell recall to our memory the labours of the illustrious dead, and at the same time remind us that the Ireland of *their* affection still needs *our* services.

W. J. O'N. DAUNT.

---

#### ART VI.—CHURCH DISCIPLINE AND PROTESTANT HISTORIANS.

IN speaking of discipline here, we do not understand it as an exercise of self-infliction or matter of private devotion. We speak of it as contradistinguished from faith and morals, or rather as their expression and safeguard. It sounds like a truism to assert that dogma is not discipline. Every well-informed Catholic knows that, however closely connected, they are essen-

---

\* The hall of the Royal Exchange, Dublin.

tially different. There are, indeed, few articles of faith that do not issue out into some external expression or symbol, while some points of mere discipline, under peculiar circumstances, have been closely bound up with dogma. But dogma, though finding its expression and defence in discipline, never can be reduced to its level; nor, on the other hand, can mere discipline, as such, ever be raised to the dignity of dogma.

Since the days of the Apostles, all the Popes and Councils have not added one jot to the body of revelation. The Church may explain and draw out the hidden meaning of revealed truth; it may propose for the belief of the faithful what, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, originally belonged to the deposit of faith; but it cannot add the smallest point of belief to what did not belong substantially to the body of revelation. Not so with discipline. Of its nature it is variable, and, for the most part, it has varied. Being an expression of an idea, it may be as different as the times and temperaments which dictated or modified it. Hence, in the Seven Sacraments their matter and form, in so far as specified by Divine institution, are invariable; while the ritual, no matter how elaborated or lengthy, may change, and, in point of fact, has changed in many particulars. Hence, too, in the Mass, the words of consecration being an essential part of it, are invariable. All the pomp and circumstance of liturgy are grouped around the dogma of transubstantiation as the central figure. Outside the words of consecration, the prayers, the singing, the incense, the genuflexions, the blessings, the music, the various attitudes of the body, and the several intonations of the voice—all are mutable, and of varied importance. Thus formerly, not as now, the "Gloria" was said by the priest turned to the people; on the other hand, the last salutation before the benediction was given, not as now, by the celebrant turned to the altar. The communion antiphon was not said, as now, after the communion, but during the administration of the Eucharist.\* The canon of Mass began not till after the singing of the "Sanctus;" whereas now the celebrant proceeds with it during the "Sanctus."† Formerly a part of the Host of a previous Mass was carried before the celebrating priest and preserved till the communion, so that no part of the Mass would be without the Blessed Eucharist. Thus, while a belief in the dogma of the Real Presence remained always unchanged in the Church, its expression has varied in different ages.

Nothing more strongly proves the force of Protestant prejudice than the confounding of the discipline of the Catholic Church

\* "Retract." lib. ii. ch. xi.

† "Museum Italicum," vol. ii. ch. cxliv.

with its dogma. Those from whom better might be expected point to the variety and variableness in discipline, and insist that the dogma of which it was an expression has also changed. They point to the various religious Orders in the Catholic Church, and exclaim, "Behold the difference in religion!" They appear to forget that difference in dress and exercises of devotion is only an accidental expression of the virtues of poverty, chastity, and obedience, the essential constituents of every religious Order. It is passing strange that what the humblest Catholic comprehends, is a stumbling-block to so many Protestants.

A distinction between dogma and discipline has always been insisted on by the Fathers of the Church. St. Athanasius, speaking of the canons of the Council of Nice, lays down rules by which they can be distinguished from each other. He tells us that, besides other criteria,\* an anathema is attached as a sanction to the canons on dogma, but not to those on discipline. The distinction between dogma and discipline is brought out by no Father of the Church more clearly than by St. Irenæus. He admits and defends the variety of practice observable in fasting; but, in doing so, says that the variety in discipline should only enhance the beauty and agreement in matters of dogma.†

The several effects of dogma and discipline are pithily described by a writer in the primitive Church in a single sentence: "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas." The statement, "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty," has passed into a proverb. The truth contained in the utterance was invaluable at all times, but since the Reformation it has become inestimably precious. Taking his rule of faith from the Bible alone, and its interpretation from private judgment, a Protestant is apt to confound dogma with discipline. Hence, men of acute intellect have been driven to the unscriptural distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals. While the Protestant mind degraded dogma to the level of discipline, by maintaining that a belief in all points revealed in Holy Writ was not essential, the Catholic Church requires assent to every revealed truth proposed with authority to the faithful. The adoption or rejection of any article of faith, or the respect with which it is received, does not depend on its relative importance to other points. On the other hand in matters of discipline great liberty is claimed. Local discipline is regulated by expediency. Even in matters of general discipline, the Church does not claim perfection. All that

\* *De Synodo.*

† "Πάντες ἐμρνέομεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ οὐ διαφωνία τῆς νειστέας τὴν ὄμονίαν τῆς πίστης συνιστήσῃ." *Apud. Euseb. lib. v. ch. 24.*

theologians claim, in insisting on the infallibility of the Church in matters of general discipline, is that the discipline is not opposed to faith or morals.

Any person at all conversant with the history of the religion of the Protestant reformers knows the canons by which that religion was fashioned and defended. He knows that various false readings in the text were adopted, that the use of tradition was ignored, that the testimony of the schismatical Greek Church was appealed to, and that dogma by the distinction into fundamentals and non-fundamentals was reduced to the level of discipline. All that had been done to the Bible was repeated in the domain of history. In order to make facts square with the religion which they fashioned out of their own conceits they read them in the false light of the Reformation, tradition was ignored, the practices of the Eastern Church were appealed to, and, above all, discipline was confounded with dogma.

At the very commencement of the so-called Reformation a knot of clever but unscrupulous men agreed on dividing the history of the Church into centuries. Each took up a different epoch to treat of; but all agreed in an endeavour to exhibit not a real Church, but one corresponding to their own views. They travestied facts, as they revolutionized religion, so as to give grounds to thoughtful men for saying that history, since the Reformation, has been no better than one vast conspiracy against truth.

Among the first and chief of the century writers, or Centuriators of Magdeburg, was Flaccus Illyricus. His real name was Matthew Flach, Latinized to Flaccus. He was born at Albona, in Illyricum or Istria. He was one of the most enthusiastic disciples of Luther. In the library of the Palatine of the Rhine he discovered an old Mass which he considered older than and different from any Roman Mass then known. Here was an opportunity of carrying out the plan of the Centuriators. At once he applies himself to decipher and publish it. It was brought out at Strasbourg in the year 1557. Its aim may be gathered from the title. The title represents the Mass as "faithfully copied from an old authentic manuscript, written about the seventh century, and older than any Roman Mass." The Mass, however, on close examination, was seen to contain prayers involving a belief in the intercession of saints, in the efficacy of prayers for the dead, and in most points of doctrine denied by the Reformers.\* This was too much for the honesty of the Centuriators. Every effort was made to suppress its circulation; and hence the difficulty expe-

\* Bened. XIV. "De Sacrif. Mis." lib. i. c. 12, n. 5. Bona, "De re-Liturg." app. vol. iii. p. 11.

rienced by the learned Cardinal Bona in searching all the Roman libraries and several foreign ones in order to procure a copy of it. The Latin Mass of Illyricus expressed the religious belief entertained once on a time in the British Isles; and it is for this reason I have singled out the work of Illyricus rather than that of any other Centuriator. Such was the eagerness with which zealots laid hold of anything showing an apparent discrepancy with Rome that the publication defeated its own object. The Centuriators in their blind zeal forgot what never should be lost sight of, that a liturgy, no matter how strange in structure and variety, involves only a matter of discipline, that all its pomp and circumstances are mere accompaniments to the great dogma of transubstantiation in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and only one of the multifarious modes of expressing an idea. This is so certain that some Catholic liturgical writers maintain that our Redeemer and His Apostles confined all rites before consecration to the mere Lord's Prayer.

The mistake committed by Illyricus, and subsequent writers who have copied him, is in taking for granted that the rites and practices selected for comparison with the Roman forms were the earliest. And even though they were to make the dissimilarity between the Roman liturgy and any other a test of doctrine, which should not be, it would be only fair to inquire whether the Mass referred to was not a recast of several others previously written. The Mass discovered by Illyricus, judged by intrinsic evidence, could not be earlier than the ninth century; whereas there is strong reason for believing that there are extant copies of Masses substantially the same as those used by SS. Patrick and Columbanus.

We have already observed that the same destructive principles used by the Reformers for revolutionizing the Word of God were applied by them for travestying history. We shall illustrate this truth by instances supplied by Illyricus and subsequent Protestant writers. The mischievous canons laid down by the Reformers, interpreted by private judgment, may be reduced to three: 1. The ignoring of tradition; 2. The appeal to the testimony of the schismatical Greek Church. 3. The distinction into fundamentals and non-fundamentals.

1. Illyricus in the heading prefixed to his published Mass was as wrong in fact as false in reasoning. For even though his statement were true as regards the antiquity of the Mass discovered it would prove nothing to his purpose. It should be borne in mind, and ought to have been well-known to him, that the Mass or form of liturgy used by St. Gregory in the seventh century was not the earliest specimen in the Church. Gregory's biographer, John the deacon, assures us that the Saint compressed into one volume the various books of Masses written by Pope Gelasius,

and that "while he retrenched some matters he added others." Pope Gelasius, in the sixth century, took the liturgy in hand, and the result has been the *Sacramentary* which goes by his name. This was well known in the British Isles; and if Illyricus had only a peep into the famous Stowe Missal he could see that the *preface* in the Mass there is styled that of Gelasius.

Nor on coming to the Gelasian *Sacramentary* in the sixth century have we sounded the lowest depths. His predecessors in the previous century, St. Leo the Great and St. Celestine I. and Innocent I. are credited with having made changes in the liturgy. But if the liturgy no longer remains in the same form as retouched or moulded by these saintly men, there is as little reason to doubt its having so existed as a belief in the Real Presence. There need be no hesitation then in asserting that the liturgy during the first three hundred years of the Church's existence had been verbally and structurally different to what it was elaborated into subsequently. As the prayers or form of liturgy are only the accidental, however important, surrounding of the substantial idea, they varied with the fortunes of the Church; and we could no more expect the same elaborated ceremonial in the Church of the Catacombs, as we find subsequently carried out in the basilicas of Christian emperors, than we could expect the ceremonies of Holy Week at Rome to be carried out in a thatched chapel in Ireland.

There has been always a tradition in the Church that for a long time a knowledge of the Liturgy as of the Bible was only orally perpetuated. It is the opinion of able writers that the "*disciplina arcani*" included not only points of belief touching the Blessed Eucharist, but even the prayers with which the tremendous mysteries were celebrated. Hence it is that for hundreds of years the Church did not venture to commit the Liturgy to writing.

By ignoring tradition the Reformers have not only curtailed the deposit of faith, but contracted the field of history. Our business is not to point out the mistakes and inconsistencies involved in the denial of tradition. Our aim is rather historical than polemical. The existence of facts of which there was no written record has been put beyond doubt by a well-authenticated tradition. There may have been no express legislation on the part of the Church as regards the abolition or introduction of a particular practice. Legislation often stepped in only to ensure uniformity and harmonize discordant elements. Of this character is the fast of Lent. It is believed to be traceable to Apostolic times, yet for a long time there was no uniform law of the Church on the time of observing it. So too with regard to the prohibition against the use of blood. There is no formal

legislation on the matter till the year 772; but we may be sure that before that time it had fallen into desuetude in particular churches. So, too, the Council of Nice invokes the Apostolic rule of not refusing reconciliation to those in danger of death, which is not found in the "Canon of the Apostles," and must have been known by tradition. In like manner there was no formal general legislation as to the beginning of Lent on Ash Wednesday till the thirteenth century, yet we may rest certain that the practice prevailed in various Churches long before that time. And if we are to regard as genuine some writings which go under the name of St. Gregory the Great, the fast of Lent in his time began as early as Ash Wednesday. At all events it is certain that the practice obtained in the next century in some Churches, though it was not of universal obligation for centuries subsequently. If, then, we were to believe in the existence of no facts without express legislation on or formal mention of them, we would miss some of the most precious facts that ever took place.

Private judgment, which made such havoc with doctrine in the written Word of God, has been no less mischievous in the domain of history. Analogous to the view taken by the private individual against the infallible decisions of God's Church is the selecting some particular fact or practice of an individual Church, and deducing from it general conclusions. It can never be too much insisted on that discipline from its very nature is variable, and that variety obtained more in ancient than in modern times. More freedom was accorded to individual Churches, as there was no danger felt that variety of discipline would lead to difference in doctrine. Hence we learn from Venerable Bede\* that when St. Augustine consulted Pope Gregory as to how he should deal with the customs found in Britain at variance with the Roman practice, the great Pope answered that everything not opposed to faith or morals might be retained. A variety of practice accordingly was tolerated. This liberty was accorded not only to different nations, but even to different parts of the same nation. This was the more necessary, as there was then as little and often less communication between different parts of the same nation than there now is between distinct and distant nations. At a comparatively late period there was the heptarchy in England; at a still later period there were several provinces in France united by the frail tie of a mere nominal subjection to a common suzerain. Then every city in Italy enjoyed the autonomy of an independent republic. In the tenth century no fewer than thirty princes in Ireland styling themselves kings appended their names to a

---

\* "Hist. Ecc." i. 27.

written document. There was great difficulty in ensuring uniformity, even under a single monarch, whose authority, without a standing army, was often no more than nominal. There was then, however, no apprehension of a danger that subsequently manifested itself, that of a National Church breaking away from the centre of unity. For these and other reasons a great variety of discipline was observable even in the same Church. The only limit put to this variety was that it should not lead to a loss of faith or charity;\* and thus the traditions of each Church, when not opposed to faith, were safely followed.† Such is the teaching of the Popes and fathers of the Church. The spirit that animated Illyricus influenced all the Centuriators; and traces of it may be detected in almost every Protestant writer down to the present time. This is clearly discernible in one of the latest works, professedly historical, written in support of the independence on the part of Churches in the British Isles of Roman or Papal supremacy.‡ Some alleged but unspecified difference in Liturgy is made grounds of an argument.§ Not only so, but even an alleged difference in the remarkably variable practice of fasting is dwelt on as a proof of divergence from Rome. It is this: the commencement of Lent on a Monday instead of Ash Wednesday.|| Before arguing on the matter it is well to make sure of the alleged fact. The beginning of Lent on Monday, so far from being a proof of opposition to Rome, proves the contrary. For we are assured on the best authority that in the early ages of the Church the practice was to commence Lent on Monday.¶ And a still further proof of variety is afforded by the Tripartite life of St. Patrick, that his Lent began on Saturday.

Perhaps there was still greater diversity of practice as to which week before Easter should Lent begin. It began with some on the ninth Sunday before Easter, Septuagesima Sunday; with others it began on Sexagesima Sunday; while most of the Western Church, at least in later times, began Lent on the seventh Sunday before Easter, Quinquagesima. This diversity, which was common to most Churches, prevailed also in our island Churches.

Diversity touching Lent extended also to its duration. Some insisted on fasting forty days. Those who did so made the

\* S. Greg. Mag. Ep. 41 ad Leand. "In una fide nihil officit sanctae Ecclesiae consuetudo diversa."

† St. Aug. Ep. 86 ad Casul. "In his rebus de quibus nihil certe statuit Scriptura divina, instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt."

‡ "Liturgy and Ritual of Celtic Churches," 1881, by F. E. Warren.

§ *Ibid.* p. 7. || *Ibid.* ¶ "Mus. Ital." vol. ii. p. 127.

length of our Redeemer's fast their model. Others\* fasted only thirty-six days, because, beginning the fast of Lent on the sixth Sunday before Easter, and excluding Sundays, they had only thirty-six days. The motive on which they founded their practice was, that a tithe of everything of their existence was due to God; and they calculated that by fasting thirty-six days in the year the tithe of the year's existence was paid.† Thus variety as to the duration and commencement of Lent prevailed in the several branches of the Catholic Church; and this variety continued during the greatest part of the Middle Ages, till towards their close a general law, which established Ash Wednesday as the beginning of Lent, ensured also uniformity as to its duration. So far from attaching any importance to diversity of practice in the peculiarly variable discipline of fasting, we can afford to dwell on a more striking peculiarity in connection with fasting in the Irish Church, though it is not alluded to by the followers of Illyricus. Besides the Spring Lent, there was a Summer Lent. It began on the Sunday succeeding the 25th of June, and ended on the Sunday succeeding immediately the 17th of July.‡ Another no less striking peculiarity in connection with the Lenten Fast is noticed in Irish manuscripts. It is that the Lent began on the Sunday following the 23rd of March, and ended on the Sunday following the 14th of April.§ This must have escaped the notice of the Centuriators, as it would afford far stronger grounds for surprise and a claim for independence of Roman supremacy than the mere beginning of Lent on Monday. This practice was not at all general, nor indeed so much acted on in Ireland as merely noticed by an Irish writer. The Irish monk, after his holy pilgrimages, and Irish scholar, after returning to his native country, gave the result of their observations. That the Irish did not content themselves with a three weeks' Lent may be known by the fact that they observed a Summer Lent, and began the Advent fast on the 15th of November. But strange as the duration of the fast already noticed may appear, it was a usage which the Irish monk could have witnessed in Rome itself. For this we have the authority of the historian Socrates.|| He assures us that in Rome some began Lent on the Sunday preceding Passion time, and that Passion Sunday was called Middle Sunday, because it divided the Lent. Mabillon indeed labours hard to prove that the term, "middle," applied to Passion Sunday did not mean the middle of Lent,

\* "Leabhar Breac," page 48, col. 1.

† "In dechmaid ar mblian," *ibid.* p. 47.

‡ "Leabhar Breac," p. 90. § *Ibid.* || Lib. 5, ch. 22.

but the middle of the latter half of Lent.\* But such an explanation offers violence to the natural, plain meaning of words. Though we must grant with Mabillon that the contrary practice alluded to was general in Ireland, Rome, and in the universal Church, still there is no good reason for denying what Socrates states, borne out as he is by Irish testimony, that some few obscure individuals were peculiar in the time of beginning Lent.

Nor have we exhausted yet the peculiarities in connection with the Lenten question, to which we have been invited by the followers of Illyricus. In looking into the festology of "Oengus Ceile Dé," a work of the eighth century, we find a commemoration of the beginning of the fast of Jesus. This feast took place on the 7th of January.† From this I infer that at one time Lent began on the 7th of January. This is made certain by another entry in the venerable "Speckled Book." After inculcating the propriety of abstaining from even lawful pleasures during the forty days of Lent, the writer proceeds to say: "You should know, however, that it was not at this time our Lord fasted. His fast began on the 7th of January, and ended on the 15th of the Kalends of March." The writer continues to state that this discipline continued down to the Council of Nice, that the fathers of the council changed the time of Lent, and extended it to Easter Sunday. The Irish writer quoted gives the three reasons which determined the fathers, and winds up by dwelling on the great advantages of fasting.‡ Before finishing my remarks on this point of discipline, I may observe that while people were allowed to fare more sumptuously on Sunday than on any other day, still there was no strict obligation of so doing. It was deemed only more congruous and to be honouring fitly the Lord's day to relax the severity of Lent on Sunday, especially as some heretics observed a contrary practice.

In Mr. Warren's work above alluded to, the rites for consecrating a nun and a church are dwelt on as proofs of difference from and independence of Rome. We allude to these points of discipline not so much, if at all, for the purpose of exposing errors in fact, as for illustrating the mischievous principle of which they are the immediate outcome. Venerable Bede in his history makes mention of the consecration of a church, accompanied by prayer and fasting.§ The inference drawn by the followers of Illyricus from these words is that the mode of consecration as at all

\* "Mus. Ital." tom. ii. p. 127.

† "Imrordus is uaisliu tossach corgas hiesu," L. B. p. 70.

‡ "Leabhar Breac," p. 48, col. 1. § "His. Ecc.," iii. 21.

noticed by the historian must have been strange.\* But, in point of fact, no mention at all is made of the mode or rite of consecration. Prayer and fasting usual then, as now, as a personal preparation for the celebrant, formed no part of the ceremony of consecration. To describe them as a form of consecration is very strange indeed, and it is no less strange to state that this preparation in connection with the consecration must have been unusual because noticed by the historian Bede. Why, such a strange canon of interpretation would revolutionize history! And even though it could be shown there was mention of some special mode of consecration in the latter part of the seventh century different from what had prevailed at Rome, what would follow from it? Nothing, unless it was proved that this was the earliest rite of consecration known to have prevailed in Rome. But this cannot be proved. On the contrary, various and earlier rites than those of the seventh century prevailed. St. Paulinus, in his life of St. Ambrose, relates that on one occasion, when the saint was proceeding to consecrate a church in Milan, the people requested him to use the same form of consecration as he had used in regard to another church near the gate which led to Rome. By this we can clearly see that there were various forms which might be lawfully used.†

Illustrative of errors in fact and principle in the same work, is a statement made in regard to the consecration of a nun.‡ The statement is that the consecration of a nun in a Celtic monastery was accompanied with the use of a crown and presentation of a white dress, which is not prescribed in the Roman Pontifical. Well, in point of fact, in the present Roman Pontifical the rubric and prayer on the occasion referred to speak of the *crown or torques*, and of the dress and veil blessed by the bishop. But even though there should be a discrepancy between the forms of consecration nothing of consequence would follow from it. The comparison should be instituted not with the present Pontifical, but with that in use at the period under consideration. To act otherwise is as illogical as to use the middle term of a syllogism in two senses. There would be no grounds for a conclusion even though it were shown that the form of consecration in the tenth century was different from that in the Roman Pontifical even then in use. In such a supposition the form of

\* "Liturgy and Ritual," &c., p. 75, n. 2.

† A form of consecration in Irish quite perfect, unless a few gaps which can be filled in from the context is found in the "Leabhar Breac," p. 277. It is so ancient that O'Donovan in his "Ir. Gr." alludes to its archaic turns; and O'Curry said that it was beyond the reach of modern dictionaries.

‡ "Liturgy and Ritual," &c., p. 23.

consecration might have been borrowed from an earlier form of the Roman Pontifical; and that there was more than one form of consecration is made abundantly evident. St. Ambrose informs us that virgins were consecrated by receiving a blessed veil.\* Again, we learn from the Acts of the Martyrs that Victoria, having leapt from out a window in order to avoid marriage with a rich nobleman engaged for her by her pagan parents, and having escaped unhurt, made her way directly to a church, where she consecrated her virginity by laying her head on the altar, and, like the ancient Nazareans, by wearing her hair long;† whereas, in Egypt and Syria the hair was cut off.‡ The discipline changed according to time and place.

The mischievous effects of private judgment and blind fanaticism in the Centuriators is evidenced in not only failing to master the entire field of history, but even to catch the meaning of the simplest term. The word *esca* occurring in the life of St. Ambrose supplies an instance. The biographer tells us that during the illness of the saint the Bishop of Vercelli Honoratus stopped in the same house with him in an upper apartment. Having retired to rest, Honoratus heard a voice repeat three different times, "Arise, hasten, for he shall soon yield up the ghost." He arose, descended from the top of the house, gave the body of the Lord to St. Ambrose, who, "having swallowed and being fortified by this food, gave up the spirit."§ Anyone acquainted, even in an elementary way, with the language, knows that the word *esca* means edible food; but the Centuriators, in order to establish the use of the chalice to the dying, would have it mean a liquid, or that by *synechdoche* it included the species of wine. Such an unnatural meaning, however, is rejected as well by the root of the word as by usage in the time of St. Ambrose. St. Augustine, speaking of the Eucharist, distinguishes between the sacred food and the inebriating chalice.||

In the early ages of the Church there occur, indeed, instances of the reception of the Blessed Eucharist as well under the species both of bread and wine conjointly as of either separately. By-and-by, when the Manichæan heresy sprang up, which taught, among other errors, that the use of wine was unlawful, the Church insisted on the use of the chalice by the faithful as a

\* "Exhort. ad Virgines."

† Ruinart, "Acta," p. 417. "St. Ambrose, ad Virgin." ch. 8. "St. Optatius," i. 6.

‡ Bulteau, "Hist. Mon." p. 170.

§ Paul. "Diac." cap. xxiv. n. 47, tom. ii. col. 12.

|| "Tanquam illa *esca* saginatus, et in calice ebrius." *Tract. in Johan.* 27, *in fine*.

test of orthodoxy. But when the heresy died out, and there remained no necessity for the use of the cup, it was discontinued owing to the inconveniences inherent in it. The use or disuse of the chalice by the faithful is a matter of discipline; because the Church teaches that Christ is received whole and entire under the species of either bread or wine. Here, then, we find an act at one time a test of orthodoxy, and of heterodoxy at another time. To estimate properly the value of a particular rite or discipline it is necessary to ascertain what idea it expressed. It is not enough that it was at variance with preceding or succeeding usages. It should be established that its use or disuse was a test of doctrine. On that account various usages as expressions of a variety of free opinion on matters not then defined by the Church are found not only in different countries but in the same national Church. The truth of this statement can easily be verified by a reference to those Celtic churches to which the Centuriators have invited us. Thus, in some Irish writings, an opinion is put forward that the punishment of the damned is intermittent, particularly for a few hours on Sunday.\* Now, on seeing this, a Centuriator would be apt to exclaim, "Behold the teaching of St. John Damascene: therefore Ireland received its faith from the East." But the same opinion was held by many holy and learned writers in the Latin Church from Prudentius† to Innocent III. We take another instance:—the diversity of manner in observing the feast of St. Patrick. Some maintained that the feast should be celebrated with pomp and festivity as if he were in person in each house.‡ Yet, in looking into other writings, we learn that the festival should not interfere with the penitential exercises of Lent.§

Again, while daily celebration of the Mass is insisted on by Irish writers;|| a different practice is alluded to in another place. Again, it is stated that there were various ways for beginning Mass until the time of Charlemagne, and that it used to begin on Saturday and end on Sunday.¶ This variety in the Irish Church is spoken of as a matter of indifference by St. Augustine, who recommended that the practice of each Church should be followed.\*\*

\* "Leabhar Breac," p. 254. "Leabhar na Huidre," p. 29.

† "Cathemerinon," v. 125:

"Umbrarum populus ab ignibus,  
Nec fervent solito flumina sulphure."

‡ "Leabhar Breac," p. 96. § "Riagail na Ceile, De," *Ibid.*, p. 10.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 258: "Vision of Adamnan."

¶ "Book of Lismore," fol. 117, R. I. A.

\*\* "Ep. 118 ad Januar." The Greek practice confines the celebration of Mass to Saturday and Sunday in Lent, and to the day of the

The enumeration of the capital sins affords another illustration of the variety of views on open questions. The sins are very generally counted eight in number by Irish writers. This, also, is the enumeration of Greek writers, such as St. John Damascene and the Abbot Nilus. But it should be borne in mind that though the capital sins are numbered eight by Irish writers, yet when specifying them they give only the number seven.\* The cause of the diversity is that St. Gregory† did not reckon Pride among the capital sins, but rather the mother of the rest; while others, many others, ranked Pride the chief of the capital sins.‡

Another instance of variety is exhibited in the different views on the crucifixion. Some representations exhibit our Saviour as fastened by three nails, while others as by four.§ This diversity in Ireland only reflects the freedom and variety in the Universal Church on the same matter. Many Greek writers represent the crucifixion with three,|| while many Latin fathers represent it with four nails.¶

So, too, a diversity of usage is observable in the Celtic Church as regarded chronology. Some followed the Hebrew,\*\* others the Septuagint computation.†† In like manner, diversity of practice prevailed as to baptism. Some used immersion, while others employed aspersion or ablution. It were an endless as it is unnecessary task to exhibit the variety observable in matters of local or free discipline even in the same Church; besides, we have dwelt too long on this matter already. But one thing is made certain—that difference of discipline should not be confounded with difference of dogma.

2. An appeal to the Greek Church is a staple argument with the Centuriators. They point to the discipline of certain branches of the Western Church as savouring of Orientalism, and conclude that a knowledge of the Christian religion must have been derived from the East rather than from Rome. But such people appear to forget that Rome was much more Oriental in its rites formerly than at present. On Holy Saturday the sub-deacon used to read his part in Greek. Once on a time the Epistles and Gospels used to be chanted in the Greek language.

---

Annunciation. "Euchologion," Goar, Leo Allatius, "Ep. ad Nahu-sium."

\* "Leabhar Breac," p. 250, col. 1. "Corpus Missal," Visitation of the Sick.

† 31 "Mer.," cap. 17.

‡ St. Thomas, "Summa summae," Quæst. cxxxii.

§ "Leabhar Breac," p. 166. An. of Boyle and Tighearnagh.

|| St. Greg. Nazian. "De Christo paciente." *τρισῆλος.*

¶ St. Cyp. "De Passione." \*\*\* "Stowe Cat.," vol. i. p. 191.

†† "An. of Boyle."

During Holy Week the twelve lessons with their prayers used to be gone through in Greek. Even still traces of such usage may be seen in several Greek words in the Liturgy under a Latin form. A great deal savoured of Orientalism, and what wonder? Did not the first Pope, with Christianity, come to us from the East? Were they not of Eastern origin, Popes Saints Cletus, Evaristus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Anaeletus,\* Soter, Eleutherius, Anterus, Sixtus II., Dionysius, Caius (a Dalmatian), and Eusebius? Now all these Popes lived before the time of Pope Innocent, who was perhaps amongst the first whose name is connected with the elaboration of the Liturgy. It is admitted that it was through St. Athanasius that the rules of SS. Anthony and Basil were made known to the Western Church. The monastic orders took their rise to the East, and what wonder that their rules, their penitentials, and their discipline were copied in the Western Church? Were not the four first General Councils, whose decrees were placed by the Reformers on the same level with the Gospels, celebrated in the East? And long before these Councils a body of canon law originated in the East. The Canons of the Apostles cited by the Councils of Nice and Aneyra, as also the Apostolic Constitutions, were known in the third century. The canonical epistles of St. Denis, of St. Peter of Alexandria, of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, of St. Basil, of St. Amphilocus, of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of St. Athanasius, of Timothy patriarch of Alexandria, of Theophilus, and of St. Cyril were quoted with respect through the universal Church. But by-and-by, when the face of Europe had been changed by Christianity, and the Church had been allowed to emerge from the catacombs, the religious life energized in the Western Church. Bearing in mind that discipline is only an expression of an idea, and that the expression is modified by times, climate, temperament, and other influences, it were strange if the Western Church did not strike out a discipline racy of the soil. The Popes took the Liturgy in hand—SS. Innocent I., Celestine, Leo; and subsequently it received further development and perfection under the hands of SS. Gelasius and Gregory the Great.

So, too, it fared with the monastic orders. A Columbanus, and more effectually still, a St. Benedict, took up the monastic rules, moulded them, and did to some extent for the Western Church what was done in the East by SS. Anthony and Basil. The adoption of the Eastern discipline for a time, and prevalence of traces of it for a long time subsequently, so far from being cause of marvel, is only what should have been expected, and almost unavoidable. A great deal of law and practice came to

---

\* He came from "Gracia Magna."

us from the East, but they came through the Popes. Thus yearly used the Popes for ages to avail themselves of the calculation of the famous Alexandrian astronomers for determining the vernal equinox, and then published to the Church the season for celebrating the Paschal feast. But the Alexandrian method of calculation, like the monastic rules, gave way by-and-by to the more correct Victorian cycle when adopted and enjoined by the Popes. And even if every scrap of discipline with the dogma were to have come to us from the East, it would not affect in the least our belief in the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff.

3. Both the inability of private judgment to distinguish dogma from discipline and also the authority of the Church, are established by a decree touching the eating of blood. It is for its historical rather than polemical interest I notice it; and the more so as it shows not only the unsoundness, but the inconsistencies of the Centuriators in their appeal to the Greek Church. A rapid sketch of the fortunes of the decree referred to will speed on my argument. It is related in the fifth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles that a dispute arose after the death of our Redeemer as to the binding nature of the Jewish ceremonies. The Apostles met in Jerusalem: St. Peter presided at the council. After mature deliberation, they decided that while some of the Jewish ceremonial was unnecessary, other parts were binding. They declare that in enacting these decrees they are under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and therefore infallible. "It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden on you than these necessary things: that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication." Now we see that blood, and things strangled, and what had been offered to idols, were put on the same level with fornication. And who, relying on his own unaided wisdom, would not imagine that these prohibitions were founded on the natural law, and fear to violate them? We know that fornication was forbidden as well by the natural as by the divine law; and what reason is afforded by the context for supposing that things sacrificed to idols or blood were not considered as permanently forbidden rather than temporary ceremonies? There was the more reason for viewing them in such a light as the Apostles set themselves to free the Jewish converts from the rest of the Mosaic ceremonial. The same prohibition was issued in the old Law against the use of blood, of things offered to idols, and of things strangled: \* and therefore, the fact that this same prohibition was renewed in the New Law, while the other portions of the ceremonial were dispensed with, would naturally

\* Levit. xvii.

lead one to judge that the prohibition was not transitory but to last for ever. This view of the ceremonial was strengthened by the reasons given by commentators for the prohibition against blood. They say that the object of the prohibition was to excite a horror of murder and to acknowledge God's power over life and death. Surely there is the same reason now as then for guarding against murder and acknowledging the supreme power of the Deity over us; and we should imagine that the same motives ought to be as sacred now and for all time as in the Old Law. We know and believe as Catholics that the prohibition against blood and things offered to idols was a matter of discipline, but we wish to point out that every ceremonial in Scripture is not necessary, and that without the authority of the Church it is not easy to distinguish what is of transient from what is of permanent obligation.

By-and-by, subsequent to the decree at Jerusalem, a question was raised in reference to things offered to idols; and St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, said that a person could eat of them unless told that they were so offered.\* "For," said he, "some until this present with conscience of the idol eat as a thing sacrificed to an idol, and their conscience being weak is defiled." Here St. Paul admits that some considered that the nature of meat was badly affected by an idolatrous offering of it, and that they became participants in idolatry by eating what was offered; and St. Paul winds up by saying that he never would eat any flesh if it were an occasion of sin to his brethren.

Some may contend that the prohibition founded on regard to the prejudices of the Jews was to cease when the Apostles were scattered through the world, and especially after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. But we find the prohibition renewed at the end of the first century of Christianity. Nearly a quarter of a century subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, and when all the other Apostles had gone to their reward, St. John Evangelist renews the prohibition against the use of things offered to idols, and places them on the same dread level with fornication. In the second chapter of the Apocalypse he says, "I have a few things against thee because thou allowest the woman Jezabel to seduce my servants to commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed to idols." His prohibition appears stricter than that of St. Paul, in that the latter forbade to one the use of things offered to idols only when told of their being offered, whereas the Evangelist unqualifiedly condemned their use. Nor did the prohibition cease with the Apostolic age. During the persecution of Diocletian,† Theoteenus, governor of Ancyra, ordered all the

\* 1. Cor. viii. v. 7. † Ruinart, "Acta Sincera," p. 336.

provisions publicly sold to be previously offered to idols in order to starve the Christians; but the holy vintner, St. Theodosius, having laid in a supply of corn and wine, saved the lives and consciences of the Christians. The same discipline, in the year 211, is beautifully brought out in the dialogue between Cecilius and Octavius. The latter, in replying to the charge of eating human flesh, says that Christians abstained from the use even of blood.\* In the fourth century sprung up a sect which from notions of extreme mortification, advocated the necessity of abstaining like the Manichees from all flesh meat. Well, a Council was held in Corduba for the purpose of condemning the error. Osius presided as Apostolic legate; and the second canon of the Council condemned those who censured the eating of flesh, except blood that was strangled and had been offered to idols. About the same time, too, as we learn from Eusebius,† the Churches of Lyons and Vienne wrote to the Churches of Asia in relation to the martyr Biblis during the persecution by Marcus Aurelius. She was accused, among other things, of having, in common with the Christian sect, eaten the flesh of an infant. In reply, she said, "how could we Christians eat the flesh of infants, as is calumniously laid to our charge, who deem it unlawful to eat the blood even of beasts." So, too, Julian the Apostate was so well aware of the scrupulousness of Christians that he had water which had been offered to idols sprinkled on the meats, bread, and fruit exposed to sale in the market of Antioch. He did this from a full knowledge of the conscientious objections which Christians entertained against such viands. He aimed at starving them into acts of idolatry or sin, and thus proved beyond question that it was deemed in the fourth century unlawful to eat what had been offered to idols.

Later still, in the Council of Quini-Sextum, held in the year 707, the sixty-seventh canon renewed the prohibition against blood and what had been strangled. Without subscribing unreservedly to all that was done in that Council, it must be accepted as an unexceptionable witness to the discipline of the Eastern Church in regard to the use of blood. Nor was the prohibition confined to the East at this time: it was in force in the Latin Church during the same period. Amongst the curious canons in the remarkable penitential of the Irish Cummean is found one prohibiting the use of strangled meats.‡ According to Ussher and Fleming he is supposed to have lived about the year 634. The prohibition, however, was repealed in the Latin

\* Minutius Felix: Tillemont, tom. iii.

† "His. Eccles.", lib. v. ch. 1.

‡ Fleming, "Præfatio St. Cummeani abbatis in Scotia orti super librum Penitentiarum."

Church in a Council held in Rome under Pope Adrian in the year 772. The Eastern Church was not so ready to abandon an Apostolic discipline. In the eleventh century Cerularius endeavoured to renew and widen the schism begun by Photius. Without recounting the several grounds principally of a disciplinary character on which the Greek patriarch sought to break with the Latin Church, one stood prominently forward, and it was that the Catholics of the Western Church did not refrain from eating blood.\*

I have dwelt on this point not so much for any interest naturally attaching to it, as for the purpose of bringing out a few points in connection with dogma. Firstly, it has been observed that abstinence from blood was put on the same level with fornication by the Apostles assembled at Jerusalem. The Mosaic ceremonials were bracketed under the same prohibition by the last surviving of the Apostles. Who by the use of private judgment could easily conclude that one was merely of a temporary character, and the other perpetual? What private individual could clearly see that one was matter of mere changeable discipline, and the other founded on the unchanging law of Nature? We cannot easily realize the difficulty of doing so unless we bear in mind that throughout the entire Church, Eastern as well as Western, the use of blood was unlawful. Secondly: Even though it be admitted that the prohibition against the use of blood and strangled things was of a disciplinary nature, still it bound under sin. In making this law the Apostles, with S. Peter at their head, were infallible as under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Now, it is a universally admitted axiom in law that an inferior cannot dispense in the law of the superior; and as a Council held in Rome repealed the prohibition, it must have claimed the same power and received the same respect from the body of the faithful as the infallible Apostolic Council at Jerusalem. I have not observed that this aspect of the case has presented itself to our dogmatic theologians. But reverting to the historical aspect of the question, we may ask with what consistency can the Centuriators appeal to the testimony of the Greek Church, which insisted on the necessity of abstaining from blood, and follow on the question the decisions and practice of the Roman See?

To sum up then: discipline has been very often only of a local character, and not unfrequently found side by side with usages of an opposite nature. And even when national, discipline for the most part was a matter of choice, and did not involve questions of faith. General discipline extending to the Universal Church may be a test of orthodoxy in one age, while in another it may be the symbol of the contrary. Discipline of its nature

---

\* Cerularius, Ep. Sigerbert de Scrip. Eccles, c. 349.

is changeable, whereas dogma admits neither of addition nor change. Discipline is found in holy writ as well as in human institutions, whereas dogma is found only in the written or unwritten word of God. Dogma is the jewel, discipline the setting ; dogma the substance, discipline the accident ; dogma the idea, discipline the many-toned expression. Sometimes, indeed, discipline may merge into dogma, as schism into heresy, but discipline as such, no matter how closely connected with it, should never be confounded with dogma.

SYLVESTER MALONE.

---

#### ART. VII.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ; OUR POSITION, PROSPECTS AND POLICY.

*The New Code, or Minutes of the Education Department, 1883-84.*

MR. MUNDELLA'S New Code, which is now in full operation, has caused no little anxiety among the supporters of Denominational Schools, and has been the occasion of a sort of agitation against the working of the Education Act as regards School-Boards. The anxiety was lest the amount of the Grant should not be as great under the provisions of the New Code as before. And the agitation was with the view of putting Denominational Schools on a more equal footing with Board Schools as regards means of support. The introduction of the New Code was looked on as an opportune occasion of expostulation on the working of the Education Act. For that Act has to a large extent been worked, not so as to supplement, but to supplant, Denominational Schools. This was not its programme. It proposed to create Board Schools in order to provide for large numbers of children for whose education no provision existed, and it was not unreasonable—for it was the only course open—that the legislature should step in to educate, to some extent undenominationally, those for whom there were no Denominational Schools, or who would not go to them. Nor was it unreasonable that all should contribute towards the support of schools which were to collect these children out of the streets and strive to reclaim them. But when School-Boards seemed to quit this work, or go beyond it, by building schools in competition with existing schools at a large outlay of public money, it was felt to be an injustice. For it is unjust to make the work of

carrying on Denominational Schools, which are still the great majority, more difficult, through tempting the better classes of children into schools of greater pretensions ; and it is doubly unjust to oblige the supporters of Denominational Schools to contribute to this result. The Education Department ought to have, and to exercise, the power of so working the Education Act, as that it should not go counter to its professed object, nor make those who hold to dogmatic religion—and they are a considerable and influential portion of the whole community—feel that they are treated unjustly, and that a particular party is making use of the Education Act to the purpose of what they designate as “extinguishing the bitterness of religious controversy.” The Vice-President of the Committee of Council must know very well that reading and explaining the Bible in schools is not identical with denominational teaching. He perhaps does not believe in the latter, but we do. Is it fair, is it statesman-like that any Act should be worked in the interest of a particular party ? Is it not making a new “religious difficulty” and interfering with religious convictions in a way not consistent with real religious liberty ?

Well ; as to the agitation, so far as it has come to anything, we are beaten. And so this is not an inopportune moment for consoling ourselves with the thought of the advantages that there are in things having gone as they have. For our own part, while feeling strongly how unfairly the School-Board system is being worked, yet we are convinced that had the injustice been remedied by Denominational Schools having a share in the School-rate, the effect would have been a greater disaster than any that has yet befallen us. Any one who is well acquainted with schools knows that the essentially different character of Board and Denominational schools consists not so much in the matter of religious instruction given to the children, as in the personal influence of the managers and teachers, which is exercised and felt to a great extent in the one, and scarcely at all in the other. Of course there are many exceptions to this on both sides ; but the ordinary condition of Denominational Schools is favourable to personal influence, care, and interest in the children, while the condition of very large schools, and such as have a public character like Board Schools, is unfavourable to it. Now, the fact of having to support and carry on a school, to pay for it, and to have to look after it, is that which awakens and maintains this personal influence, which is so invaluable to the welfare of the children. It is above price and cannot be purchased. And it is produced and kept up by the sight of and contact with those who are dependent on it.

Now, what would happen if our schools were no longer depen-

dent for support on the exertions of our managers and the contributions of the faithful? As it is, we all know how much this characteristic of Denominational Schools is lessened by the strain put on the children to "pass," on the teachers to satisfy the Inspector, and on the managers to get a good grant. But to make our schools independent of our care and exertion and support is to cut them adrift from the shore, and to leave them to be carried beyond all reach of our control. When the Catholic Bishops of Ireland were consulted at the time of the disestablishment of the Irish Church as to how far they desired that some provision should be made for the clergy from national resources, they returned the wise and grand reply, that they could not afford to give up the tie of being dependent on the support of their flocks.

Had the proposal that the Government Grant should be increased to Denominational Schools, so as to relieve them from pecuniary difficulties, and thus put them on a level with the Board Schools, been assented to, we should have been in no small danger of our control and influence over the schools being reduced to a low point. For it is inevitable that those who pay for the school should in the long-run have paramount influence over it. It unavoidably and not unreasonably gives them the power to inquire into how the money is spent and what is got for it. It gives them a footing in the school, and makes them the strongest in determining disputed points, and in making it appear reasonable that others should yield to them. Yet still it is a great safeguard to be under the control of a central power, which has ordinarily no motive for being wayward, unfair, or unpleasant, which is under the public eye in all its ways, and can be appealed to, and corresponded with. But even so, would not Government influence have in time become paramount? But to obtain support for Denominational Schools from the school-rates would be to give local authorities a standing in the schools—a right for them to have their say, to inquire, object, and control; and this on the part of men who would often have little judgment, less knowledge of school matters or management, and too often not even the forbearance and courtesy of gentlemen. Would it not be simply intolerable to be subjected to the dictation of an overbearing majority of local magnates in the matter of educating our children? Would the managers of Anglican Schools relish the visits of a School-Board, perhaps of Dissenters or ultra-Radicals? Should we not have got rid of disputes on church-rates, only to have the same local miseries and jealousies brought in again under another name?

There is then, to our mind, good reason to be satisfied that the cry for having our share in the school-rates was not responded

to. As to the outcry against the New Code, on the ground that our schools will not earn so much as before, it yet remains to be seen whether this is the fact. We have noticed during the last thirty years, that whenever a change was proposed in the conditions of the grant to schools, there has always been an outcry arising from the same sort of anxiety; yet when once the new rules were understood, they in their turn were clung to, and any change was deprecated. So we believe it will be in this case. What the Education Department is aiming at is making Education universal and effective. To economize and reduce expenses is not their present object, but rather to increase their influence and power in promoting and improving National Education. They show no signs of wishing to starve schools, but rather to have them attractive and well-filled. And the principle of the chief changes in the grants seems to be the reasonable one of taking the circumstances of localities and of particular schools into account in estimating their merit and efficiency—allowing for difficulties on the one hand, and for good efforts and exertions made on the other—so as to encourage good schools and meritorious exertions by grants which could not have been earned under the rigid rules of the last Code. Some schools, no doubt, will not earn so much as before; but our view of the general tendency of the new conditions is supported by the testimony of those whose schools have been examined under the New Code, the tone of whose communications is on the whole cheerful. *This is not, as we think, what we have to be alarmed at.*

If, however, we follow Mr. Mundella's advice to the school-masters, and "look at the matter less exclusively from a pecuniary point of view," we shall find real ground for some anxiety in the changes of the New Code. To speak distinctly, we think the money-question is not the important one, but the question of interference. We fear encroachment on the liberty of management which our schools have hitherto enjoyed. If our freedom has hitherto not been all that we desired, yet the matter is admittedly not without difficulties, and there was some necessity that those who were disbursing large sums of public money should make some very definite regulations with regard to the conditions on which the grants were to be paid. Nor can it be contended with truth that these regulations were absolutely inconsistent with full attention to the requirements of religious instruction and discipline. What they did in effect was to put great *inducements* before teachers and managers to seek first—not the Kingdom of God and His justice—but a brilliant report and a big grant.

This policy, if policy it was, has been more effective than we like to own. And in the meantime there has been going along

with it a process of—what shall we call it?—interference?—with our schools. Not professed interference; the circulars to inspectors have expressly inculcated on them not to interfere with the managers. But putting aside cases of an unpleasant character, which seem to have been exceptional, the tendency of the position and work of an inspector is that he should be treated with great courtesy, respect, deference, and even more than this. It has not been unnatural that his opinion, advice, and wishes should be asked by teachers and managers, and should be very carefully followed. Inspectors, out of good-nature, kind-heartedness, an interest in the success of education, and other pleasant motives, have been ready to suggest advice and give hints; and it has not been an uncommon thing for them to take a sort of friendly and influential position as regards the school they inspect, converting an unpleasant relationship into a pleasant one.

Unfortunately, this relationship, though pleasant, is not a very safe one. The inspector has his own line of business, and his work and aims are not identical with those of a Catholic manager or teacher, who ought to attend to interests which are not precisely those of the inspector. The latter might easily give advice too exclusively in the interests of secular education, to the injury of due attention to the religious teaching and training of the children. And if, in connection with this, we bear in mind that, while the inspector is ordinarily well acquainted with the art of practical teaching and school management, the manager is often without this knowledge and experience, the difficulties of his position are seen to be more complicated. It is very desirable to be free from any petty jealousy in the matter, to be large-minded, and ready to welcome pleasant relationships and friendly help in the secular education of the school; but, on the other hand, it is important to keep the management of the school in our own hands, not in name only, but in reality. And the point of our observations is this: that the New Code, by the very fact of its putting into the hands of the inspector a new power—that of estimating the general merit and special circumstances and difficulties of each school, and from the merit grant depending on his report—incidentally facilitates to a considerable extent the danger to which we have referred.

Even before the New Code came in it was possible to look at some of our schools and to come to the conclusion that, while the manager had the trouble of the school and the anxiety of finding the means, yet the real master who had the control was the inspector. Will things go still more in this way now? Will our schools slip out of our hands, and that not so much for want of money as by its agency?

So much for the New Code. But the most anxious and

gloomy prospect is not, after all, from the changes in the Code, but from the action of the School-Boards. In saying this, we are quite prepared to believe that in many places no such anxiety is felt. There are localities in which Catholics are numerous, and there is a strong and healthy public opinion among them which will check the mischief that would otherwise occur. There are many places in which local influences are strong enough to withstand the natural course of things. But it is difficult to resist the conviction that the mischief that has begun will grow and spread. Every month there are fresh School-Boards called into existence. Every month there are new schools built and opened under School-Boards, and, in one place after another, Denominational Schools are handed over to the School-Boards. All this progress is in one direction: there is nothing to set off against it in the other. The School-Boards are not hampered for means; and while they are able, in some cases, to cause smaller schools to be condemned as unfit places for education, they can raise large and pretentious buildings themselves, and furnish them amply. They are not stinted in the number of their teachers, nor in the salaries they give to them. Their schools have the prestige of being new and public institutions. They are filled or filling with large numbers who are attracted to them, and they seem to lay themselves out more for securing the attendance of the respectable children than the outcast or neglected. We fear we must add that local influence is sometimes exerted to depreciate and discountenance the old schools, and to turn them into refuges of the irregular and disorderly. There is, further, plenty of worldly pride and regard for public opinion amongst the working-classes, and any schools that lose their character for respectability are simply done for. Neither the children nor the parents will go on facing the ill-natured remarks and ridicule that are directed against those that frequent the despised school. Even where it has not come to be despised, yet our poorer neighbours pride themselves not a little on sending their children to "the best school," and "the best" is determined by the size of the building and the amount of the payment. "I send my girl to the Government School, Mrs. Jones. I would not send yours to that old twopenny place, if I were you;" and Mrs. Jones sees the force of the argument and is convinced.

Now, our own people are not without this sort of feeling, and we ask ourselves whether there are not a good many places in which there is danger of Board-Schools being frequented by numbers of our own children. Let us look the situation in the face, and answer the question: Is there not real cause for anxiety, not so much about the money coming in, as the children? We

cannot compete with Board-Schools in outward appearance and pretensions; perhaps not, as to success in secular knowledge—which is what most parents look to—for they have great advantages over us. To what then do we trust for maintaining the character of our schools in the estimation of the public, so that they shall not be driven out of the field by their big neighbours? And what precautions can be taken to prevent our schools being frequented and overrun by other children—the disorderly and irregular—until our schools lose, not only their reputation, but even their real character?

We turn, then, to the practical question of what line of action is best under our present difficulties and prospects? This question is narrowed by the consideration of what we can do; for we cannot beat the Board-Schools in popular education—in such an education, that is, in the subjects of the day as people are most anxious for. If with more slender resources and greater difficulties we can do as well as they, yet the world in general will not believe that we can do as well; and therefore the *tendency* of things will be for our school-children to be taken away and sent to the Board-Schools; the destitute, backward, disorderly and irregular being left to us.

How can we counteract this tendency? What policy can be expected to succeed?

To speak of it as a question of mere policy is to weaken and degrade our position. It is a question of duty. What can, what ought we to do towards keeping and educating our children, whether we can succeed or whether we cannot?

Three things seem important. First, to do all in our power to maintain in its integrity the position accorded by the Education Act to Denominational Schools. That position seems to us not an altogether unfair one. No claim is made to interfere with managers, and the inspectors have been directed by the Education Department not to do so. Their work is limited to the duty of ascertaining that the conditions of annual grants have been satisfied. There is no need of any hostility or jealousy in regard to them. But we can fairly claim on our own part to retain the independence of position which is the privilege for which we pay so dearly. We have to be wide awake against any encroachments on it on the part of the Educational Department, or School-Boards, or School Attendance Committees and their respective officers, or through the school drifting into the hands of inspectors through the fears or obsequiousness of teachers. Nothing will secure this so well as managers being well acquainted with the duties of their position, and being attentive and intelligent about them; but if this cannot be secured, much good might be done by direction and advice of a diocesan inspector of long experience, who had the

power of inquiring into these questions and putting managers on their guard against dangers and difficulties of which they might not be aware.

(2) As regards the parents and their temptation to send their children to what all the world says are the best schools, something very material may be done, in all cases where the schools are fairly efficient and respectable, by raising the school fees. It is curious, almost comical, how the bulk of men value a thing in proportion to what they pay for it. "Answer a fool according to his folly." We have to deal oftentimes with small people who cannot see beyond their noses, and whose ideas and feelings are such only as they pick up from their surroundings. It is a mistaken compassion which leads kind-hearted priests and soft nuns to remit and abate school-fees. There are, of course, special cases which ought to be exceptionally treated. But the *rule* is, that if the parents are not made to pay fairly high fees they despise the school, and show it by keeping their children away for slight reasons, and on the least pretext sending them to a "better school." "I have but one piece of advice to give you on this subject," said a shrewd old Jesuit father to us many years ago, "Make them pay *well*, sir." If only it is done considerately but firmly; the consequences need not be feared, and the effects are very beneficial in raising the estimate of the school, and so retaining the attendance of the children.

(3) But in many localities, especially active centres of industry, something more than this is often desirable. It is indeed right and wise to appeal strongly to the conscience of parents not to send their children to non-Catholic Schools—far more wise than to make fruitless efforts to persuade them that our schools are just as good as Board-Schools; yet it is not wise, nor indeed reasonable, to call on men to make great sacrifices for the sake of religion, unless where no alternative is possible. The Holy See, in a letter on this subject (to the Bishops of Belgium, if we recollect right), declared that parents could not be permitted to send their children to non-Catholic Schools, unless in the case of those who had no access to Catholic Schools *suitable to their station of life*, and provided that care was taken that the children did not receive religious instruction in the non-Catholic Schools, and that they did receive it at home. Now, it is coming to be a matter of more and more frequent occurrence that Catholic parents, if they would send their children to Catholic Schools, have no choice but to send them to one that is not quite suitable to their station in life. And we ought not, if possible, to call on them to make this sacrifice. What we want for a relief for their difficulties, and as a safeguard for the protection of Catholic education against the undue pretensions of Board-

Schools, is to open a higher class of schools. Such schools would still be admissible to grants if the weekly payment did not exceed 9d., or they might take the higher position of middle-class schools in which quarterly payments were received. A great deal has been done, especially in some localities, in the way of establishing and fostering such schools, which need not be a burden and anxiety to the clergy, as Elementary Schools are; but to increase and multiply such schools would be a "present remedy" against dangers that seem to stare us in the face.

(4) Another suggestion we venture to submit timidly; for it is hard to carry out against so many arguments and great inducements to the contrary, yet *ruinous* if we do not. It is to moderate our eagerness for success in secular knowledge, and go in for success in school-training and discipline. "What," many will say, "sacrifice the grant! Why, I could not keep my school open at all." No, not sacrifice the grant, but be prepared, if so be, to forego a small portion of the grant for the sake of a greater good. We are not advocating, let it be understood, any neglect of the subjects of the year. But what is the common boast of teachers and managers is that they have passed 90, 95, or 100 per cent. This, no doubt, is a good thing to do, but it is not the only nor even the chief thing. An article appeared in this REVIEW four years ago, which, speaking on this subject, predicted that mere intellectual instruction would not be found to produce results that would satisfy its advocates—that moral training and discipline was still more important. We see with pleasure a recognition of this in the New Code, the chief characteristic of which is a change of principle in making grants. The highest grants are no longer to be given to the schools that give instruction in the greatest number of subjects and pass the greatest number of scholars, but, besides and beyond this, schools are to be classified according to merit—into Fair, Good, and Excellent, and a proportional grant is to be made. The estimate of merit is to take into account other considerations outside the actual success in examination, such especially as determine the general condition of the school as a place of education, and we desire to call particular attention to the prominence which is given to the moral tone and training of the scholars. Unless there is evidence of this being attended to, the mark of *Excellent* is not to be given. We especially rejoice to see teachers reminded that due attention to scholars who would *not* bring money or credit to the school by their examination is one of the evidences of the school being an *Excellent* one. We transcribe some passages taken from the Code, and from Sir F. Sandford's circular to the inspectors on the changes and application of the New Code.

After stating (§ 109) that the merit grant is to depend on the inspector's report, allowing for the special circumstances of the case, as (1) the organization and discipline, (2) the intelligence employed in instruction, and (3) the general quality of the work, especially in elementary subjects, the explanatory paragraph says :—

To meet the requirements respecting discipline, the managers and teachers will be expected to satisfy the inspector that all reasonable care is taken, in the ordinary management of the schools, to bring up the children in habits of punctuality, of good manners and language, of cleanliness and neatness ; and also to impress upon the children the importance of cheerful obedience to duty, of consideration and respect for others, and of honour and truthfulness in word and act.

The circular to inspectors says that—

Inferences derived from them [the quality and number of the passes] may be modified by taking into account the skill and spirit of the teaching, the neatness of the school-room and its appliances, the accuracy and trustworthiness of the registers, the fitness of the classification in regard to age and capacity, the behaviour of the children, especially their honesty under examination and the interest they evince in their work.

Further on the circular says :—

A school of humble aim which passes only a moderately successful examination, may properly be designated *fair* if its work is conscientiously done and is sound as far as it goes, and if the school is free from any conspicuous fault. The mark of Excellent [the circular goes on to say] is to be reserved for cases of distinguished merit. A thoroughly good school in favourable conditions is characterized by cheerful yet exact discipline, maintained without harshness and without noisy demonstration of authority. Its premises are cleanly and well ordered ; its time-table provides a proper variety of mental employment and physical exercise ; its organization is such as to distribute the teaching power judiciously, and to secure to every scholar, whether he is likely to bring credit to the school by examination or not, a fair share of instruction and attention. . . . Above all, the teaching and discipline are such as to exert a right influence on the manners, the conduct, and the character of the children, to awaken in them a love of reading and such an interest in their own own mental improvement as may reasonably be expected to last beyond the period of school life.

We hail with pleasure this recognition of two principles which lie at the root of all good school-education, (1) that a school should be valued and estimated according as it can be recognized to be in general, and on the whole, a good institution, carefully and conscientiously carried on, and not merely from particular

effects produced on a special occasion, and which may be dependent on unavoidable or accidental circumstances ; and that (2) this education consists, "above all," in influencing the manners, conduct, and character of the scholars. Whatever criticisms we may be inclined to make on the above passages, as not going far enough for the aim and purpose of Denominational Schools, or being open incidentally to some objections, yet, on the whole, it brightens the prospect for our schools to find so distinct a recognition and encouragement of that which we, by our principles, must look on as the main object and work of education.

This point of school-discipline and training is that which especially concerns us, and from more than one point of view it is of extreme consequence that we should pay our chief attention to it. There is no danger nearer to us than that of our schools being forced into the position of refuges for the destitute and disorderly—not that there is a higher or greater work than to reclaim such, if it might be, but we must bear in mind that as we take in children of this class by one door, the children of orderly, well-conducted, respectable families go out by the other. It is surely due to these latter that the school, the only school very often, to which they can conscientiously send their children should not be made unfit for them. Moreover, we cannot reclaim the disorderly and irregular but by enforcing order ; and as we do this, we in effect close the door of the school to them, since their little game is to go to a school in which order is *not* enforced. Nor can we hope to effect anything by a school in which order and discipline is not attended to. In the presence, then, of this danger of our best children being carried off by the Board-Schools it is in every way our wisest course to pay the greatest attention to school-discipline, since thereby we shall preserve the character of the school from being overrun with children who do not seek education, but to avoid it ; and if, after all, our numbers are diminished, and we are in some cases left with but a little flock, what is more important than to do all we can in training the conduct and forming the character of those few ?

We may not have it in our power to make our schools distinguished above the rest for pre-eminent success in the number of passes and knowledge of many extra subjects ; but there is no reason why we may not always be as successful, and indeed much more so than others, in influencing the conduct and forming the character of children by good discipline. We have more traditional experience and more advantages than others ; we can and ought to succeed better.

It is well, indeed, that in all schools the importance of good discipline and moral training should be appreciated and encouraged.

But what can Board-Schools do in this way compared with what we can do? Ordinarily, very little. Self-restraint, a sense of duty, regard for others, an obedient spirit, strict integrity, truthfulness, and conscientiousness—these and the like virtues cannot be inculcated with success without the stimulus of adequate motives, and these are only efficiently supplied by the convictions of religious faith. Those teachers, therefore, who can set before children definite statements of great truths, of which they are themselves intimately convinced, will have a power and means of influence over them which others cannot have. School-Boards may be able to beat us in secular attainments, but in all that concerns moral training we have the advantage of them. This is the hopeful point of our position under the present discouraging prospect. The number of our children may be diminished, our grants may possibly be lessened, but the effect of religious influence and of personal care and interest cannot be prevented. They will have their effect, and they will have it in more than one way. They will have it in sustaining and increasing the reputation of our schools, and thus lessening the unfair influence of Board-Schools in carrying off our children. The individual care and personal interest bestowed by good teachers on the children has a powerful present effect in leading them to love the school, and their parents to value it. Thus many will be kept from leaving our schools, and others, after going elsewhere, will return to them. But the greatest effect will be that it will come to be recognized that our schools turn out the sort of article which is felt to be wanted—scholars that are not merely well instructed, ready, and intelligent on the subjects of an elementary education, but, above all, softened and refined, upright and truthful, reliable and trustworthy, and with thought for the feelings and care for the wants of others.

Is not, then, our truest wisdom, as well as our plainest duty, to strive to abate an excessive eagerness to gain high distinction and large grants for success in examinations, and to turn our chief attention to what even the world is coming to see to be needful, and what is especially important to our interests and position?

There are not wanting prophets who foretell that it is of little use to lay out plans for our schools, as Denominational Schools are doomed. We will not discuss the question. Perhaps it is so. But at present they exist. If our time is short, it is of all the more consequence that we should make the very best use of it with the children who are still in our hands, to give them a good religious education and careful training, that when they go forth they may feel that they owe something to the Catholic School which they could not have got from Board-School educa-

tion. If, indeed, it is so, that we are only waiting to be eaten up, till public opinion is "ripe" enough, as one of the Ministry expressed it, to make an end of us; yet, even so, what better chance have we but to hinder the ripening of public opinion in this direction by convincing it of the practical value of our schools, in managing our own people and in contributing useful members to society? It might come to be inclined to prolong their existence, as the Turks keep the Armenians in Constantinople, not because they love them, but because they find it useful to have some reliable people to whom they can entrust their property. It is not quite so certain that public opinion will be mellow enough for some time to be prepared to break the implied compact of the Education Act with the Denominational Schools. If the extinction can be brought about insensibly and painlessly, well; but if the patient should kick and raise a dust throughout the country, a good British feeling, of liking fair play, might be raised at an inconvenient moment; or the stimulus given to the patient by the attempt to extinguish him might awaken a lurking tenderness for religion which has still, we are inclined to believe, a nest in old John Bull's heart. He is not an over-pious fellow, and he knows it, but he has some sort of feeling that he ought to be, and he has a real respect for religious people, provided he has no suspicion that they are hypocrites or humbugs. If he is afraid that he is somewhat of an old heathen himself, yet he is not at all desirous of his belongings coming out in that line. So if it came to a stand-up fight between Denominational Education and French Secularism, we do not feel sure that he would not, at the last push, express a feeling of not altogether liking the look of the foreign importation, and that he does not see why he can't do without it, and go on in the old way.

If, indeed, public opinion does get so "ripe" that society ferments and rots, and one section of it, giving up the principle of liberty, turns on the others to oppress and extinguish it, that will be indeed an evil day for our country. For England has prospered, and excited the envy and admiration of other countries, chiefly because there is more of true freedom and less of interference with men's ways and convictions than elsewhere. To upset this is to spoil that which is our pride; and to turn against religious convictions, and strive to root them out, will prove an evil and a bitter thing. Yet what does this mean for the Church but that it is to return once more to times of persecution? And as persecution has in our own days purified religion in other countries, and given it a life and vigour it had not before, so perhaps it may turn out that this is what is needed amongst ourselves.

## ART. VIII.—BEGINNINGS.

SCENE.—*The Garden of a Hydropathic Establishment at Malvern.* TIME—September.

ALBAN. ROMANUS.

ALBAN. You are a Roman Catholic priest. I always like to talk to you priests, because you have something definite to stick to. Our parsons will argue with you; but when you get to the end of it, you cannot find out what they believe themselves.

ROMANUS. It seems to me a very strange thing that you, who openly profess that you believe in nothing at all, should be so fond of discussing matters of faith and of religion.

ALBAN. I suppose I am a little nervous—[smiling.] A man past middle age, sent home invalided from India, and ordered to Malvern for general repairs, is apt to find himself thinking about two or three things that he thought very little about in his younger days. We men of the nineteenth century find our English law and security, and our English habits and culture very sufficient as long as our tissues are healthy, our nerves in good order, the action of our hearts vigorous, and our lives fairly provided with excitement and danger. The truth is, very few of us, when we are young, stop to think at all. We use our minds to master useful arts, to beat our competitors and to succeed in life. But we don't think. The moment a man begins to think, he seems to want a religion of some kind. When life moderates in pace, and when pain, like a dark familiar first comes to be our daily companion—when nerve and muscle refuse to answer as they once did, and ominous warnings begin to spoil our pleasures, then, explain it as you may, there comes a lifting of a curtain, and we seem to see what we had never seen before. I don't really think we are frightened, most of us. But, as sensible men, and, I hope, men who are not bad at heart, it strikes us—at least it strikes *me*—that questions as to what a man really is, as to his future, his duty, and above all, his Maker (if he has a Maker) are worth thinking about. And, what is more to the point, my experience is that they *demand* to be thought about.

ROMANUS. Why demand?

ALBAN. Because, say what we will, these questions surround us as palpably as the hills tower above us or the Severn winds in the plain below. Books are full of them; history is full of them; our own lives are full of them. Belief or conviction, has

moulded history and inspired wide generations; nay, it affects probably all the men and women we know, and it has left indelible traces on our own hearts from the training of our childhood. The moment one begins to think, a great fact like this is sure to arrest one's deepest attention. It is like waking up and finding ourselves for the first time in the presence of the sea. But there is something else; something which, I confess, disturbs me far more. I seem to have interior *convictions* on some of these great questions.

ROMANUS. You cannot help believing there is a God and a future state?

ALBAN. I do not believe at all. And, perhaps, I am wrong to use the word "conviction." For I do not in the least accept or hold what my interior prompting seems to urge upon me. What I mean is simply this. I am not importuned (by my mental monitor) to believe in a future state or in an immortal spirit. It seems to me that whatever logic or philosophy may or may not prove about this, I have no imperative need to believe that my soul, or myself, will live for ever. Why should not a man fall asleep and never wake, as he falls asleep every twenty-four hours and wakes again? But the more I commune with myself, the more I seem to see the fitness of a *Supreme Being*. First of all, it seems fitting that some one should look after the cause of order in this universe. The evolution theory, I grant, explains things without the necessity of an original design, or of any design or purpose in nature or in man. But, besides that the evolution hypothesis, as stated by Darwin and Spencer, is evidently incomplete, my mind—and, I suppose, the minds of my generation—do not naturally take to it. Waste in Nature is against my reason, or my instinct; and the huge periods and infinitesimal progress of evolution to me mean waste, especially if I consider the intellect of man, and see how little the slow evolution of Nature seems to profit the noblest kinds of thought and aspiration. Then, again, we all have ideas of right and wrong, and the ideas of all of us, on the whole, coincide. I cannot help thinking, or feeling, that what is universally held to be right ought to have the best of it in this universal system of Nature. But, notoriously, right is not victorious. Even if you take the whole of the immense term of years during which things have been evolving, the right never has been uppermost, and there is no sign of it now, and no sign of its coming about in the future. Therefore, I believe in a force of Nature which answers to my conception of Nature. I am urged to accept a power (in Nature or out of Nature I do not know, but, at any rate, a Supreme Power) which should rectify all this, and put right above mere force. And if every man, when he dies, comes

into the realm where this Supreme Power acts, I am still better satisfied. Suffering, poverty, misery, and cruelty cannot be natural, in the full and final sense of that word. But if there is no Rectifier, there seems to be no chance of these things ceasing, and no chance of any human life being, on the whole, at once worthy and happy. There is a third reason or instinct which pushes me in the same direction. I feel that my heart or my being wants a final and supreme friend. My own experience—which I take to be that of my race and generation—is, that nothing is worth having or living for except some kind of love. Love as a mere fierce passion is soon over with most men. But love as a calm continuous aspiration—love of wife, of children, of friends—and the imperative need of it, grows more intense as one grows older. I am not denying that most of us are more or less selfish. But this illustrates what I mean. The preservation, the well-being of this atom of consciousness which I call myself, is my first and my anxious concern. Let me admit that. But I feel I am helpless. I cannot be comfortable, I cannot even keep alive without some one's help. The forces of Nature sweep on, regardless of me, and I must simply conform to them or keep out of their way. I have, therefore, a natural tendency to cling to those who can help me, and a strong instinct which demands kindness, care, and friendliness. It is surely impossible, I feel, that I am made merely to perish, and to perish, perhaps, by some stupid mistake or preventible accident. Some one must care for me. I cannot be abandoned. Now, if there is one thing more certain than another it is that nothing visible above the horizon of Nature will stand by me in my sorest need. I mean that, when the decay and the break-up which is called death comes, nothing on earth can prevent my dying. My money, which epitomizes all force and safe-guarding, my dearest relations, my most trusty friends, can accompany me as far as the door of the tent where Death waits for me, but the hour comes when I disappear within it, and they must remain outside. Have I a friend on the other side of that threshold? Have I still some one who loves me and cares for me, and will take my part? I want to think I have.

ROMANUS. Nothing could be better put. Your own reason has led you to believe in God.

ALBAN. I repeat to you, I do *not* believe. What I have been giving you is not reasoning at all. There is not a shred of argument in it. I say I *feel* these things; *want* to believe them. But that is no more valid proof that they are realities than my longing for £10,000 a year is a proof that I possess £10,000 a year.

ROMANUS. This is a question which deserves discussion. I

believe you have got your thoughts into a knot, and I should be glad to help you to disentangle them. I have listened with much interest to what you have been saying, and you will allow me to make a summary of it in my own way. You find, first of all, that you are urged by some mental force to believe that the human spirit is a thing in many respects different from the rest of Nature; so different, so much apart from all other things you know of, that it seems impossible but to think that the rest of Nature has been intended to exist for the sake of man. You find that the theory of evolution, taken without qualification, is a theory of waste and a theory of blind force; and waste and irrational force your mind refuses to accept as the ultimate explanation of things, because it experiences that even itself (your mind) works to an intended purpose, and with as little waste as possible. So much for Nature. Secondly as regards evil. You think that pain and evil cannot prevail in the ultimate issue. Your mind and heart require a judge or rectifier. And, finally, you find that the human heart, whose very life and well-being it is to love and be loved (in some wide sense), which has the most sensitive instinct of self-preservation and dreads destruction, must have a supreme and final friend.

ALBAN. You express my meaning fairly enough. But let me say again, very emphatically, that these "views" are mere feelings or instincts, and not in any sense belief, much less a conviction of the intellect.

ROMANUS. You use words which require some defining process before we shall know what we are talking about. There are four noticeable terms in what you have just said: you speak of feelings, instincts, belief, and intellectual conviction. First, as to feeling. In my opinion, the word "feeling" ought to be reserved to that class of perceptions in which the organs of the body or brain have a share. The feeling of fear, for instance, is a well-known example of a perception which is chiefly corporeal, seated in the nerves, and often independent of conviction—nay, frequently dead against all reason. Now, these "views" of yours are grounded upon reasoning—at least, to some extent. You say, "That which is blind, or penal, cannot be ultimate; there must be a means of avoiding ultimate destruction. Therefore, there must be a Rectifier, a Designer, an ultimate Friend." This is a rough syllogism. And the first premiss, or universal, on which it depends, is certainly not a perception of our nerves, but of that sovereign human reason which can abstract and universalize. Therefore, I would not call your "views" feelings. Neither would I call them instincts; because an instinct is a blind impulse operating without reflex knowledge. Thus, the bird builds its nest without knowing why, and without knowing

that it knows at all. And although it is true that certain extremely rapid decisions which our reason takes are called instincts—as, for instance, when we speak of national instincts or of Catholic instincts—still these are really rational *habits*, formed by repeated acts of reason, reinforced by the discipline of our imagination. Now, the judgment on which you ground your “views” are certainly conscious and reflex, and, on the other hand, they are not the effect of habit, but are primary.

ALBAN. More the effect of habit than we think, perhaps. We imbibe these notions with our mother’s milk. Perhaps we should never have had them unless we had been children in a Christian family.

ROMANUS. You are wrong. We imbibe in our Christian education not principles but details. We learn that there is a God, and that He is good and just. We are never told why there *must* be a God. We learn that sin will be punished; we are never told why sin exists at all. We learn that we shall live for ever in happiness or in misery; we are never taught the ultimate proof of the soul’s immortality. And, if you observe, these “views” of yours are not the lazy, half-conscious result of your catechetical impressions; they are the deliberations of a man who has long thrown off the Christian teaching of his youth, who distrusts and repels it, and who is now simply analyzing that mind which exists as an undoubted fact, and whose analysis ought to yield undoubted fact.

ALBAN. You would maintain, then, that these “views” of mine are given in the very constitution of my mind, and are not the outcome of experience or of teaching?

ROMANUS. At any rate, let us not call them, except in a wide and improper sense, instincts. Neither are they faith. To a Catholic, faith means acceptance on the authority of another person. In modern English speech faith or belief often means an inclination, chiefly emotional, to accept a view or a position without examination. Taking faith in this latter sense, your “views” might perhaps come under it, except for this reason. Your “views” are, to a certain extent, against your will. You *want* to believe it is true, but you will not, and your “wanting” is in spite of your “willing.” Now, this duality is very significant. It is not here a question of the flesh lusting against the spirit, of the lower appetite contending against the rational will. You “will not” believe; that is certainly your rational or intellectual will; you “want” to believe; what power is this? What hidden source or spring is this, the water of which comes pressing upwards through the sand in spite of your putting your foot upon it? Observe, it is an “intellectual” want; it is distinctly grounded on intellectual perceptions, and supported by

them ; it is no mere emotion to which you cannot give rational shape ; much less is a mere craving of the sense. It is apparently something more radical than conscious and reflex "willing" ; but it is assuredly bred in the same spiritual region and belongs to no lower sphere. Now it is obviously inconvenient to call this perception or these "views" by the name of faith ; though I am aware that some modern (non-Catholic) writers do so. But when they do, it is a sign to me that they are nigh to giving up all attempt to set faith upon any rational basis. Their position, generally, is that "belief" in God and immortality is a blind instinct which will not admit of analysis.

ALBAN. But surely you are not going to tell me that my "views" are solid intellectual *convictions*, capable of demonstration like the truths of science ?

ROMANUS. I am certainly going to affirm to you that your certainty of your views is very much greater than your certainty of anything in science. Certainty in science is of two kinds—the certainty of facts, and the certainty of laws. The certainty of an isolated fact is not "scientific" except as a foundation for science. The certainty of laws depends upon a mental intuition ; that steel of a certain quality will sustain a certain tension, or that the transit of a planet across the sun will occur on a given day depends upon the assumption or the intuition that the forces of Nature are always uniform. How do I know that Nature is always uniform ?

ALBAN. Experience, as they say, proves it.

ROMANUS. But it is obvious that there cannot be any experience of the "always," which is the essence of the matter.

ALBAN. I suppose we are so constituted that we accept experimental uniformity as a proof of absolute uniformity.

ROMANUS. I am far from saying we are not. A man who would not accept scientific law or believe in the uniformity of Nature would be beyond the pale of argument. There are persons who do not admit they exist, or who doubt whether they feel, or who are not sure whether they think. No one believes that these doubts really exist in any rational creature. But when people affirm that they doubt in these ways, there the matter must stop. No argument is any longer available against them. Your lever has no fulcrum.

ALBAN. I think I see what you are coming to. The intuitions on which the laws of science rest are not capable of exact demonstration ; yet the man who does not accept them is irrational. So, you would say, is that man irrational who refuses to accept certain other intuitions in a different order.

ROMANUS. My object is something like that. Let me formulate the intuitions of which we are going to speak. 1. Final waste

and final aimlessness in the universe are impossible. 2. Pain and evil cannot finally prevail. 3. My being must be protected from final destruction. Now what we mean when we say that these "views" are intuitions of the human mind is that the human mind is so made that it cannot take any opposite "view." We do not deny that it may *say* the opposite; a given mind may say, "I think that waste and pain and evil and destruction, such as they have been from the beginning and are now, will be to the end." But what is maintained is that that mind is self-deceived, or does not understand the terms. A child or half-imbecile might say and think that a triangle was capable of having four angles; an uneducated person would not see that the two angles at the base of an equal sided triangle must be equal. So confusion, or prejudice, or obstinacy might persuade this or that mind that these "views" are not certain. But we hold, first, that the vast majority who think at all would take these "views"; secondly, that the more clearly you put them before uneducated people, the more they would pronounce them reasonable and cling to them; thirdly, that the opposites would meet with determined rejection from human consciousness. Waste, pain, injustice, evil and destruction are ideas perfectly agreed upon by the human race. Now every atom of this human race violently resists, intellectually at least, each and every one of these. "It is wrong." "It ought not to be." "I will not submit." "Right will be done some day." "Things are meant to come right." "God help me, for I am alone!" These judgments and aspirations are a transcript of human intelligence—just as the engraving transcribes the incised plate. They do not mean that there cannot be evil or pain or waste or destruction; but that these things cannot be final, but must give way to good, to well-being and to beneficent design.

ALBAN. I think I admit that these "views" are universal in human nature. But I can hardly admit they are intuitions of fact. Human nature says, "It ought not to be;" but human nature does not absolutely say, "It will not be."

ROMANUS. But in this case it is the same thing. When an announcement is made as to the future, or the invisible present, it must either be a prophecy which is scientifically the same as actual vision, or it must be a deduction from a law. The only way in which my mind can foresee is to consider its own laws.

ALBAN. But surely an aspiration is not the same as a law.

ROMANUS. We are back again! That every aspiration is the same as a law, I am very far from affirming. That certain primary "aspirations," or intellectually necessary convictions of the human mind, are the same as laws can, I think, be easily proved. Universal human nature has certain unalterable convictions and views; these views constitute its well-being; its well-being is essential to it; therefore, these convictions are essential.

ALBAN. Why is its well-being *essential* to it?

ROMANUS. Because on the lowest theory of formation or production, anything that exists is the outcome of necessary laws, and therefore its well-being is the same as its being, and although here and now it may be hurt or damaged by forces outside of it, yet on the whole it will be well, because it exists. My body is made to grow, digest, and walk, and on the whole it does so; my mind is so formed as to take certain views, and if these views are fallacies my mind does not exist at all; for the same forces which formed it, formed it with this peculiar constitution.

ALBAN. I confess you somewhat startle me. Can we be right in saying that the "views" of the mind are the same as the mind itself?

ROMANUS. I do not say so. I say that certain views are a *part* of the essential constitution of the mind.

ALBAN. But does not your argument prove that whenever we think anything to exist, it really exists?

ROMANUS. Not in the least—except in the very special case which we are discussing. When, under ordinary circumstances, the mind affirms the existence of anything outside itself, that affirmation or perception has to be carefully checked by other perceptions before we can be reasonably sure that we are affirming correctly. A man with one eye shut will not measure distance aright; an excited brain hears imaginary noises; diseased organs convey wrong impressions. And, in the sphere of intellect, many a process of reasoning is incomplete and fallacious, and many conclusions are therefore erroneous. But we are here dealing with a wholly different class of "views" from any of these. We are considering intuitions which the human race *cannot get rid of*; views which, the more we analyze and compare them, the faster they stand and the more clearly they come out. Intuitions of this kind are as essential to the mind in which they are found as radiation is essential to heat. The difficulty you have in accepting this point of the argument is that these "views" are at one and the same time psychological facts and processes or principles of perception. We justly mistrust mere perceptions, for perceptions may play tricks with us in some of the ways I have mentioned. But when a perception, or view, or intuition (call it what you will), is constant and permanent, independent of the environment of the individual, and only awaiting the presence of the objective world to flash out and be recognized, like some lighthouse flame over the troubled sea in the hazy night, then that perception is more than a perception; it is, or it immediately rests upon, a necessary fact or law of the human mind. It is of the essence of man's mind, whoever or whatever made his mind and himself.

ALBAN. I think I see that.

**ROMANUS.** Then I argue thus. The mind of man refuses to accept, cannot by its constitution accept, the view that evil or aimlessness or destruction will finally prevail. On the contrary it radiates, if I may use the word, luminous intuitions, which formulate the exact opposite. Now no man can go back upon, or get behind, primitive perceptions like these. He may imagine he does, or do so in words, as when a troublesome schoolboy insists that he cannot see that the shortest distance between two points is necessarily a straight line. But these laws or intuitions are as much a consequence of our mental make as the law on which depends the certainties of science. Now it is admitted that a man who refuses to accept scientific certainty is not to be argued with—is an intellectual outlaw. Then what else are we to say of him who refuses to accept the primary pronouncements of his intellect in a sphere, it is true, which is more removed from experience, but yet in a matter which is not one whit more incapable of exact verification than the scientific intuition? You act on the one; why not act on the other?

**ALBAN.** To act upon a view merely, is very poor in comparison with demonstrating it. You would make the views of faith merely a working hypothesis.

**ROMANUS.** By no means. Let us pass the word faith, which you here apply to views concerning man's primary views of his nature. There are two kinds of truths which cannot be demonstrated; those particular truths for which there are no premisses, and those primary truths which are themselves the first premisses of all. There must be premisses which are primary, and therefore indemonstrable, or else we could never begin to reason at all. The way to arrive at such truths as these is to *look*, not to argue. Logic will help you to clear away the rubbish, but when the rubbish is out of the way, you have only to use your eyes.

**ALBAN.** I must confess you have given some shape to my thoughts. It seems that I must either accept the intuitions of my being or sink into the condition of a sceptic. Now a sceptic is a character which, as a man of common-sense, I despise. If I am to doubt my own existence, or the existence of things outside of myself, all thought and all life are a mere comedy and a juggle; and of all things difficult to believe I find this the most difficult. But now, where are we in our discussion? You have driven me on—and yet, in one sense, I find myself less advanced than I was before. I began by saying that I felt the necessity of a Supreme Being; you have proved, perhaps, that I have necessary intuitions. I was urged to believe in a Supreme Rectifier and final Friend; you have given me nothing but abstractions, and I confess I do not think it worth my while to trouble myself about abstractions.

**ROMANUS.** Stop a little. We have not finished our argument. I am going on. We seem to have arrived at this point—that the human mind “radiates” the absolute law of design, of ultimate good and of final love. Now I am going to ask you where the human mind gets this constitution from?

**ALBAN.** I must presume that the mind has grown so—developed into that kind of nature. The gradual refinement of primitive motion has resulted first in the sensitive power and then in the intelligent.

**ROMANUS.** I will not stay to discuss that answer, from which I utterly disagree. But I will ask you to look your own intuitions in the face and say whether it is possible that these notions of necessary law can have come from anything lower than the mind itself. Surely no transformation of motion can result in the judgment that evil cannot finally prevail. You might as well say that a week can be divided into acres, or the land into propositions, as say that physical motion can result in the abstract or the universal. The very primitive operation of intellectual knowledge—the affirmation or negation of a predicate—the judgment that grass is green, or that snow is not black—meant the power to see as distinct two things which are never separate in Nature, I mean a subject and its quality; and this is to universalize—to abstract from conditions; and molecular motion can never be more than a condition of an individual thing.

**ALBAN.** I think it does seem unreasonable not to distinguish between strictly mental operations and mere motion or even feeling. I suppose we must say that the mind itself is the source of its intuitions?

**ROMANUS.** To my judgment, not that either. But observe, first, that the moment you give up the complete evolution theory with regard to man's mental constitution, you have to look for another origin for it. Now the mind cannot be self-existent; no one holds that; not the evolutionist, because he holds it was evolved from matter; not the Christian, because he holds special creation. But we may waive the question of its self-existence, for a reason which will appear presently. The mind, then, is luminous with intuitions which, implicitly at least, accompany its very birth. But what is the mind? An individual consciousness. Of such individuals there are, have been, will be, millions. They are all quite distinct; they are not conscious of one another, they formulate opposite acts of will, take very different views, and move in very different lines and planes. Yet in one thing they are alike—in their all being luminous with the same light. If I see a radiance on the sails of the passing ships I turn to look for the rising or the setting sun. Therefore, I argue the existence of a universal source of intellectual light.

ALBAN. But why not argue, also, to a universal source of hardness or colour?

ROMANUS. So I would, but with a difference; the source of physical constitutions cannot be physical. Besides, blind essences necessarily follow the law of their birth; intelligences, speaking broadly, necessarily differ from one another wherever they are not constrained by a law higher than their own will, which law cannot have come wholly from their own sources, because their own sources are just what has given them the power to differ—that is, reason and the rational will. But really we may leave that difficulty, for I could travel by that road, some day, almost as well as by my own. What I say is, that universally existent intuitions argue a common source.

ALBAN. Well. Still a "source!" I want a person.

ROMANUS. But do you not see? An intellectual radiance means an intellect; an intellect means a person. Therefore, there exists a person in whom primarily are found the intuitions which your mind radiates.

ALBAN (*reflecting*). This seems better; this seems more comforting. Then, when I have the intuition of necessary law, I have the intuition of a necessary mind?

ROMANUS. I would not say so. Radiance is not the radiant thing. But the truth is, analogies fail us here, from the highly spiritual nature of the subject. Let me take you a step further, and you will see why I say so. If the source of intellectual light be a Person, He must be self-existent, or we should go on *ad infinitum*. If He is self-existent, then He is all that existence can be; in other words, the Infinite.

ALBAN. Then my interior promptings have been right, after all, and I have been very near to my God. Then it is this voice or illumination which gives me these thoughts, which, when followed out, end in Him. May I say that I *see God*?

ROMANUS. No; because, as God is the Infinite, whatever likeness of Himself exists in a created or limited Nature must be created and limited in its substance, though it may be practically infinite (or indefinite) in the limitless views or aspirations of which it is the source.

ALBAN. But I may believe in my Rectifier, and my ultimate Friend?

ROMANUS. Assuredly you may. To deduce the attributes of God from what we have already laid down would be very easy. Given the personal Infinite, and no man need despair, or doubt, or fear; because we are in His hands; and if love, fatherhood, and friendship, if beauty, truth, and goodness mean anything to our minds, they must mean at least as much in His, though we shall never know how much more.

LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII. ON HISTORICAL  
STUDIES.

*Dilectis Filiis Nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus Antonino de Luca, Vice  
Cancellario S. R. E., Joanni Baptista Pitra, Bibliothecario S. R. E.,  
Josepho Hergenröther Tabulariis Vaticanis Praefecto*

LEO PAPA XIII.

DILECTI FILII NOSTRI, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

**S**ÆPENUMERO considerantes, quibus potissimum artibus confidant qui Ecclesiam et Pontificatum romanum in suspicionem invidiamque adducere nituntur, satis cognoveramus, ipsorum conatus multa cum vi et calliditate in historiam christiani nominis esse conversos, maximeque in eam partem, quæ res gestas complectitur Pontificum romanorum cum ipsis italicis rebus colligatas atque connexas. Quod cum nonnulli Episcopi nostrates idem animadvertisserint, commoveri se dixerunt non minus cogitatione malorum, quæ inde consecuta sunt, quam futurorum metu. Etenim injuste simul et periculose faciunt qui plus odio romani Pontificatus quam rerum veritati tribuunt, illuc non obscure spectantes, ut superiorum temporum memoriam mendaci colore fucatam novis in Italia rebus servire cogant. Quoniam igitur Nostrum est non solum jura Ecclesiae cetera, sed ipsam ejus dignitatem et Apostolicæ Sedis decus ab injurya vindicare, cum velimus ut vincat aliquando veritas, et itali homines agnoscant unde sibi vis beneficiorum maxima et antea percepta et in posterum speranda sit, decrevimus de re tanti momenti vobis, dilecti filii Nostri, consilia Nostra impertire, eaquæ sapientiæ vestræ ad perficiendum committere.

Incorrupta rerum gestarum monumenta, siqui tranquillum et preiudicatae opinionis expertem intendat animum, per se ipsa Ecclesiam et Pontificatum sponte magnificeque defendunt. Licet enim in iis institutorum christianorum germanam naturam magnitudinemque intueri: inter fortia certamina inclitasque victorias divina vis Ecclesiae virtusque cernitur, et manifesta factorum fide eminent et apparent collata a Pontificibus maximis beneficia in universas gentes magna, sed in eas majora, quarum in sinu Sedem Apostolicam providentia Dei collocavit. Quamobrem qui Pontificatum ipsum conati sunt omni qua possent ratione et contentione lacessere, consentaneum iis erat haudquaquam parcere testi tantarum rerum historiæ. Reapse integritatem eius attentare adorti sunt, idque arte et pervicacia tanta, ut arma illa ipsa, quæ essent ad propulsandas injurias optime comparata, ad inferendas detorserint.

Istud lacessendi genus tribus ante sæculis usurpavere præ ceteris Centuriatores Magdeburgenses: qui scilicet, cum auctores fautoresque opinionum novarum ad expugnanda doctrinæ catholicæ præsidi minime valuissent, ipsi, nova velut acie, in concertationes historicas

Ecclesiam compulerunt. Centuriatorum exemplum omnes fere scholæ, quæ a doctrina veteri defecissent, renovarunt: idemque, quod est longe miserius, nonnulli persecuti sunt religione catholici, natione itali. Illo igitur, quo diximus, proposito pervestigata sunt vel minima antiquitatis vestigia: singuli prope tabulariorum tentati recessus: evocatæ in lucem fabule futilles: commenta, refutata centies, centies iterata. Circumcisus sæpe vel conjectis astute in umbras iis quæ sunt tamquam rerum lineamenta majora, præterlabi reticendo libuit gloriose facta et merita memorabilia, intentis acriter animis ad consecutandum exaggerandumque si quid esset temere, si quid minus recte gestum: cuius quidem generis cavere singula plus difficultatis habet, quam quod hominum natura patiatur. Immo etiam licere visum est incerta vitæ domesticæ arcana scrutari sagacitate improba, arreptis inde in medioque positis quæ prona ad obtrectationem multitudini spectaculo simul et ludibrio facilius fore viderentur. Ex Pontificibus maximis vel ii, quorum virtus excelluit, sæpe notati vituperatique perinde ac cupidi, superbi, imperiosi: quibus rerum gestarum gloria invideri non potuit, eorum reprehensa sunt consilia: illaque audita millies insana vox, de ingeniorum cursu, de humanitate gentium male Ecclesiam meruisse. Nominatim vero in civilem romanorum Pontificum principatum, libertati majestatique eorum tuendæ non sine divino consilio institutum, eumdemque et jure optimo partum et innumerabilibus benefactis memorabilem, acerrima male dictorum falsorumque criminum tela coniecta.

Iisdem vero machinationibus et hodie datur opera, ut, si unquam alias, certe hoc tempore illud vere dici possit, artem historicam conjuraticem hominum videri adversus veritatem. Et sane, renovatis vulgo prioribus illis insimulationibus, serpere audacter mendacium videmus per laboriosæ volumina et exiles libros, per diariorum volitantes paginas et apparatus theatrorum illecebras. Ipsam rerum antiquarum recordationem nimis multi adjutricem ad injurias volunt. Recens illud in Sicilia specimen, quod cruentæ cuiusdam memoriaræ occasionem nacti, multa invecti sunt in decessorum Nostrorum nomen, mansuris etiam consignata monumentis agresti immanitate dictorum. Idemque paullo post apparuit cum honores publice tributi sunt homini Brixensi, quem seditiosum ingenium et infensus Apostolicæ Sedi animus insignem posteris reddidere. Tunc enim aggressi iterum sunt incitare populares iras, itemque Pontificibus maximis ardentes contumeliarum admovere faces. Siqua vero commemoranda fuerunt omnino Ecclesiæ perhonorifica, in quibus omnes calumniarum aculeos manifesta lux veritatis obtunderet, extenuando tamen dissimulandoque data est opera, ut pars laudis meritique quam minima posset ad Pontifices redire putaretur.

Illud vero gravius est, hanc similitudinem tractandi historiam ipsas in scholas invasisse. Persæpe enim pueris commentarii ad edendum proponuntur aspersi fallaciis: quibus illi assuefacti, præsertim si accesserit doctorum aut perversitas aut levitas, facile imbibunt venerande antiquitatis fastidium, rerumque et personarum sanctissimarum inverecundam contemptionem. Primordia litterarum super-

gressi, non raro in discrimen adducuntur etiam majus. Nam in majorum disciplinarum meditationibus ab eventuum narratione ad rerum proceditur caussas: a caussis vero exædificatio legum petitur ad judicia temere facta, que sæpius cum doctrina divinitus tradita aperte dissentiant, et quorum ea omnis est ratio, dissimulare ac tegere quid et quantum instituta christiana in rerum humanarum cursu eventorumque consequentia ad salutem potuerint. Idque a plerisque suscipitur nihil laborantibus quam sibi parum ipsi cohærent, quam loquantur pugnantia, quot quantisque tenebris eam, quæ philosophia historiæ dicitur, involvant. Ad summam, ne agamus de singulis, omnem historiæ tradendæ rationem eo convertunt, ut suspectam faciant Ecclesiam, invisos Pontifices, et illud maxime persuadeant multitudini, civile romanorum Pontificum imperium incolumenti et magnitudini rerum italicarum obesse.

Atque nihil dici potest, quod a veritate magis abhorreat, ut permixtum videri debeat, accusationes hujusmodi, quæ tot testimonii tanta vi redarguntur, verisimiles videri multis potuisse. Profecto semper interne posteriorum memorie historia commendavit summa Pontificatus romani in Europam merita ac nominatim in Italiam; quæ ab Apostolica Sede commoda et utilitates, ut erat proclive factu, una ex omnibus accepit plurimas. In quibus illud primo loco commemorandum, potuisse Italos in iis, quæ religionem spectant, intactam a dissidiis retinere concordiam: permagnum sane populis bonum, quo qui potiuntur, ii præsidio ad prosperitatem publicam et domesticam firmissimo potiuntur. Et ut singulare quiddam attingamus, nemo unus ignorat, post afflictas Romanorum opes formidolosis incursionibus barbarorum fortissime ex omnibus restitisse Pontifices romanos; eorumque consilio et constantia effectum esse nec semel, ut, represso furore hostium, solum italicum a cede et incendiis, Urbs Roma ab interitu vindicaretur. Et qua tempestate Imperatores Orientis curas cogitationesque omnes alio derivarant, in tanta solitudine et inopia nusquam rerum suarum tutelam nisi in romanis Pontificibus Italia reperit. Quorum in illis calamitatibus spectata caritas plurimum valuit, aliis accendentibus caussis, ad initia civilis ipsorum principatus. Cuius quidem laus est, conjunctum semper cum summa utilitate communis fuisse: quod enim licuit Apostolica Sedi omne rectum studium humanitatemque provehere, et ad civiles rationes virtutis sue porrigitur efficacitatem, et res, quæ habentur in civitate maximæ, conjunctim complecti, certe huic caussæ non exigua gratia debetur, quod civilis principatus libertatem opportunitatesque præbuit tantis peragendis rebus necessarias. Quin etiam cum decessore Nostros impulerit conscientia officii ut jura imperii sui ab hostium cupiditate defendenter, hoc ipso pluries externarum gentium dominatum magna Italie parte prohibuerunt. Simile quidquam recentiore est etiam perspectum memoria, quo tempore maximi imperatoris victricibus armis Apostolica Sedes non cessit, et ut sibi omnia principatus jura redderentur, a federatis regibus impetravit. Neque minus illa italicis hominibus salutaria, quod sæpenumero Pontifices romani voluntati principum non justæ libere repugnarint: et quod, Europæ viribus

fœdere icto consociatis, Turcarum, per iterata vulnera imminentium, immanissimos impetus insigni fortitudine sustinuerint. Duo prælia maxima, deletis italici iisdemque catholici nominis hostibus, alterum in agro Mediolanensi, alterum ad Echinadas insulas, opera auspiciisque Apostolicæ Sedis et suscepta et pugnata sunt. Expeditiones Palæstinenses, auctoribus Pontificibus initas, vis est et gloria navalis Italorum consecuta: item leges, vitam, constantiam res publicæ populares a sapientia Pontificum mutuatae sunt. Ad laudem Apostolicae Sedis magnam partem pertinet quæsitum italico nomini ingenii studiis atque artibus decus. Facile interituræ Romanorum Greco-rumque litteræ erant, nisi reliquias tantorum operum Pontifices et Clerici velut ex naufragio collegissent. In Urbe vero actæ perfec-tæque res altius loquuntur: veterum monumenta ingenti sumptu adservata: nova condita et summorum artificum operibus exulta: musea et bibliothecæ constitutæ: scholæ instituendis adolescentibus apertæ: Licea magna præclare fundata: quibus de caussis ad hanc laudem Roma pervenit, ut communi hominum opinione mater optimarum artium habeatur.

Ex his aliisque multis cum tantum lumen eluceat, nemo non videt, infestum italico nomini prædicare aut Pontificatum per se, aut civilem Pontificum principatum, idem plane esse ac de rebus perspicuis et evidenteribus velle mentiri. Flagitosum consilium scienter fallere, et venenum malum historiæ facere: multoque magis in hominibus catholiceis eisdemque in Italia natis reprehendendum, quos plus quam ceteros gratus animus deberet et religionis suæ honos et caritas patriæ non ad studium modo sed etiam ad patrocinium veritatis hortari. Cum vero ex ipsis Protestantibus satis multi acri ingenio et æquo judicio opiniones non paucas exuerint, et compulsi veritatis viribus Pontificatum romanum commendare non dubitarint quod sit humanitatem utilitatesque permagnas in republica efficiens, indignum est quod multi ex nostratis contra solent. Qui in historicis disciplinis adamant adventicia pleraque; et scriptores externos, ut quisque instituta catholica pejus vexat, ita sequuntur et probant maxime, fastidiendos rati summos ex nostris, qui cum historiam scriberent, caritatem patriæ ab obsequio et amore Apostolicæ Sedis dijungere noluerunt.

Interim tamen vix credibile est quam sit capitale malum historiæ famulatus servientis partium studiis et variis hominum cupiditatibus. Futura quippe est non magistra vita neque lux veritatis, qualem esse oportere veteres jure dixerunt, sed vitorum assentatrix et ministra corruptiæ: idque præsertim hominibus adolescentibus, quoram et mentes opinionum implebit insaniam, et animos ab honestate modestiaque deflectet. Percutit enim historia magnis illecebris præpropera ac fervida juvenum ingenia: oblatam antiquitatis effigiem et illas imagines virorum, quos velut ad vitam revocatos in conspectu narratio ponit, amplexantur cupide adolescentulæ et altius in animo retinent ad diuturnitatem insculptas. Itaque hausto semel a teneris annis veneno, vix aut ne vix quidem ratio quæreretur remedii. Neque enim illa est satis vera spes, futurum ut ætate sapient rectius, dedis-

cendo quod ab initio didicerint: propterea quod ad historiam penitus et considerate pertractandam pauci sese dedunt: matuiore autem aetate, in consuetudine vita quotidiana plus fortasse offendent confirmandis quam corrigendis erroribus loci.

Quamobrem permagni refert huic occurrere tam praesenti periculo, et omnino videre ne diutius in materiam ingentis publice privatumque mali ars historica, quae tantum habet nobilitatis, traducatur. Viri probi, in hoc disciplinarum genere scienter versati, animum adjiciant oportet ad scribendam historiam hoc proposito et hac ratione, ut quid verum sincerumque sit appareat, et quae congeruntur jam nimium diu in Pontifices romanos injuriosa crimina docte opportuneque diluantur. Jejune narrationi opponatur investigationis labor et mora: temeritati sententiarum prudentia judicii: opinionum levitati scita rerum selectio. Enitendum magnopere, ut omnia ementita et falsa, adeundis rerum fontibus, refutentur; et illud in primis scribentium obversetur animo, *primam esse historiae legem ne quid falsi dicere audeat: deinde ne quid veri non audeat; ne qua suspicio gratiae sit in scribendo, ne qua similitatis.* Est autem in scholarum usum confectio commentariorum necessaria, qui salva veritate et nullo adolescentium periculo ipsam artem historicam illustrare et augere queant. Cujus rei gratia, perfectis semel majore mole operibus ex fide monumentorum quae habentur certiora, reliquum erit capita rerum ex illis operibus excerpere litterisque mandare dilucide et breviter; caussa quidem minime difficultis, sed quae non minimos habitura est usus, ideoque dignissima, in qua vel excellentium ingeniorum elaboret industria.

Non est autem hujusmodi palestra intractata et nova: immo vero est summorum virorum non paucis impressa vestigiis. Siquidem rem historicam, sacris quam profanis rebus veterum judicio propriorem, studiose Ecclesia vel ab initio coluit. Per medias illas quae in exordia christiani nominis incubuere cruentas procellas, complura acta et rerum monumenta incolumia conservata sunt. Itaque cum pacatiora tempora illuxissent, florere in Ecclesia studia historicorum cœpere: Oriensts et Occidens doctos labores in eo genere vidit Eusebii Pamphili, Theodoreti, Socratis, Sozomeni, aliorum. Et post imperii romani occasum, quod humanioribus artibus ceteris, id et historicæ usuvenit, ut nusquam nisi in monasteriis perfugium, nec fere alios, praeter Clericos, cultores nanciseretur: ita plane ut, si sodales religiosi de scriptitandis annalibus minus cogitavissent, notitiam prope nullam ne rerum quidem civicarum longo temporis intervallo haberemus. Ex recentioribus vero commemorare duos illos satis est, quos nemo superavit, Baronum et Muratorium. Prior enim virtutem ingenii sui subtilitatemque judicii incredibili eruditione cumulavit: alter vero, quamvis in ejus scriptis *multa reperiantur censura digna*,\* tamen ad res vicesque italicas illustrandas tantam vim congesit monumentorum, ut nemo majorem. Iis vero plures annumerari facile

\* Benedictus XIV., Epist. ad Supremum Hispaniæ Inquisitorum, 31 Julii, 1748.

possent et clari et magni, quos inter pergratum recordari Angelum Maium, amplissimi Ordinis vestri decus et ornamentum.

Artem ipsam historiæ philosophicam magnus Ecclesiæ doctor Augustinus princeps omnium excogitavit, perfecit. Ex posterioribus qui in hac parte quiddam sunt memoria dignum consecuti, Augustino ipso usi sunt magistro et duce, ad cuius commentata et scripta ingenium suum diligentissime excoluerunt. Qui contra a vestigiis tanti viri discessere, eos error multiplex a vero deflexit, quia cum in itinera flexusque civitatum intenderent animum, vera illa scientia caussarum, quibus res continentur humanæ, caruerunt.

Igitur si de disciplinis historicis optime omni memoria Ecclesia meruit, mereat et in præsens: præsertim quod ad hanc laudem ipsa ratione impellitur temporum. Etenim cum hostilia tela, uti diximus, potissimum ab historia peti soleant, oportet ut se quis armis congregiatur Ecclesia, et qua parte oppugnatur acrius, in ea sese ad refutandos impetus majore opere muniat.

Hoc consilio alias ediximus, ut tabularia Nostra præsto essent, quantum potest, religioni et bonis artibus provehendis: hodieque similiter decernimus, ut adornandis operibus historicis, quæ diximus, opportuna ex Bibliotheca Nostra Vaticana pateat supellex. Nihil dubitamus, dilecti filii Nostri, futurum ut vestri auctoritas officii vestrorumque opinio meritorum facile vobis adjungat viros doctos, in historia scribendique arte exercitatos, quibus recte possitis pro singulorum facultate suum cuique assignare opus, certis tamen legibus auctoritate Nostra sanciendis. Quotquot vero studium operamque suam vobiscum in hanc caussam collaturi sunt, erecto bonoque animo esse jubemus, et singulari benevolentia Nostra confidere. Res quippe agitur digna studii patrocinio Nostro: in qua sane spem utilitatis plurimam collocamus. Nam firmis ad probandum argumentis cedat necesse est opinionis arbitrium: conatusque adversus veritatem diu susceptos ipsa tandem per se superabit et franget veritas, quæ obscurari aliquandiu potest, extingui non potest.

Atque utinam quamplurimi excitarentur veri investigandi cupiditate, et inde utilia ad recordationem documenta caperent. Clamat enim quodammodo omnis historia, Deum esse qui rerum mortalium varios perpetuosque motus providentissime regit, eosque vel invitis hominibus ad Ecclesiæ suæ incrementa transfert. Item e dimicationibus illataque vi Pontifikatum romanum semper evasisse victorem: oppugnatores ejus, dejectos de spe, suam sibi perniciem comparavisse. Neque minus aperte historia testatur quid sit de Urbe Roma jam inde ab origine sua provisum divinitus: scilicet ut domicilium sedemque perpetuo præberet beati Petri successoribus, qui hinc tamquam e centro universam christianam rempublicam nullius obnoxii potestati gubernarent. Cui quidem divinæ providentie consilio nemo est repugnare ausus, quin serius ocius inania coepta senserit.

Hæc sunt, quæ tamquam in illustri posita monimento intueri licet, undeviginti seculorum confirmata testimonio: nec absimilia censemendum futura quæ reliquum afferet tempus. Nunc quidem prævalentes hominum sectæ, Deo et Ecclesiæ suæ inimicorum, omnia in Pontificem

romanum hostilia audent, compulso in ipsam ejus sedem bello. Quare hoc contendunt, debilitare vires sacramque potestatem romanorum Pontificum comminuere; immo Pontificatum ipsum, si fieri posset, extinguere. Quae hic post expugnationem Urbis acta sunt, quæque etiamnum aguntur, nihil dubitare sinunt, quid in animo habuerint qui sese ad novas res architectos et duces præbuerunt. Ad hos accessere non eodem fortasse consilio plurimi, quos nimurum constituenda augendæque reipublicæ studium cepit. Ita numerus crevit decertantium cum Apostolica Sede, et romanus Pontifex in eam misere conditionem dejectus, quam gentes catholicae concorditer deflent. Illis tamen nihil sane melius incepta succedent, quam ceteris ante eos eodem proposito, audacia pari. Ad Italos vero quod attinet, vehemens istud cum Apostolica Sede certamen, injuria et temere susceptum, caput est ingentium domi forisque damnorum. Ad alienandos multitudinis animos, adversari quidem Pontificatus dictus est rebus italicis; sed incriminationem iniquam ac stultam ea ipsa, quæ supra commemoravimus, satis convineunt. Idem vero, sicut antea omni memoria, ita in posterum non nisi prosperus et salutaris futurus est italicis gentibus: propterea quod haec ejus est constans immutabilisque natura, bene mereri et prodesse in omnes partes. Quamobrem non est virorum rationibus publicis bene consulentium maximo isto beneficiorum fonte Italiam prohibere: nec dignum italis hominibus caussam suam cum iis communicare, qui nihil aliud quam Ecclesie perniciem meditantur. Simili modo nec expedit nec prudens consilium est cum ea potestate configgere, cui perpetuitatis est sponsor Deus, historia testis: quam ut toto orbe catholici religiose verentur, ita eorum interest, esse omni ope defensam: quamque ipsam principes rerum publicarum et agnoscant et plurimi faciant necesse est, his præsertim tam trepidis temporibus, cum fundamenta ipsa, quibus hominum nititur societas, propemodum vacillare videantur. Omnes igitur, in quibus est vera patriæ caritas, si saperent et vera viderent, in eo maxime deberent studium curamque ponere, ut amoveantur funesti hujus dissidii caussæ, et Ecclesie catholicae tam æqua postulanti ac de juribus suis sollicita ea, qua par est, ratione satisfiat.

Ceterum nihil magis optamus, quam ut ea, quæ commemoravimus, sicut litterarum monumentis consignata sunt, ita animis hominum penitus adhærescant. Hanc ad rem vestrum erit, dilecti filii Nostri, quanto majorem potestis sollertia industriamque conferre. Quo autem vester et eorum, qui vobis navabunt operam, magis fructuosus sit labor, cælestis patrocinii auspicem vobis illisque universis Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Roma apud S. Petrum die xviii Augusti, Anno 1883. Pontificatus Nostri Anno Sexto.

LEO PP. XIII.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII.  
ON THE ROSARY.

*Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis Primatibus Archiepiscopis et  
Episcopis Universis Catholicorum orbis Gratiam et Communioneum  
cum Apostolica sede Habentibus*

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

**S**UPREMI Apostolatus officio quo fungimur et longe difficiili horum temporum conditione quotidie magis admonemur ac propemodum impellimur, ut quo graviora incident Ecclesiæ calamitates, eo impensis ejus tutæ incolumitatique consulamus. Quapropter, dum quantum in Nobis est, modis omnibus Ecclesiæ jura tueri, et quæ vel impendit vel circumstant pericula anteverttere et propulsare conamur, assidue damus operam cælestibus auxiliis implorandis, quibus effici unice potest, ut labores curæque Nostre optatum sint exitum habiturae. Hanc ad rem nihil validius potiusque judicamus, quam religione et pietate demereri magnam Dei Parentem MARIAM Virginem, quæ pacis nostræ apud Deum sequestra et cælestium administra gratiarum, in celsissimo potestatis est gloriæque fastigio in calis collocata, ut hominibus ad sempiternam illam civitatem per tot labores et pericula contenditibus patrocinii sui subsidium impertiat. Itaque proximis jam anniversariis solemnibus, quibus plurima et maxima in populum christianum per Marialis *Rosarii* preces collata beneficia recoluntur, preces hasce ipsas singulare studio toto orbe catholico adhiberi Magne Virgini hoc anno volumus, quo, Ipsa conciliatrice, divinum Ejus Filium nostris placatum et mitigatum malis feliciter experiamur. Has igitur litteras ad Vos, Venerabiles Fratres, dandas censuimus, ut, cognitis consiliis Nostris, populorum pietas ad ea religiose perficienda vestra auctoritate studioque excitetur.

Præcipuum semper ac solemne catholicis hominibus fuit in trepidis rebus dubiisque temporibus ad Mariam confugere et in Materna Ejus bonitate conquiescere. Quo quidem ostenditur certissima non modo spes, sed plane fiducia, quam Ecclesia catholica semper habuit in Genetrici Dei jure repositam. Revera primævæ labis expers Virgo, adlecta Dei Mater, et hoc ipso servandi hominum generis consors facta, tanta apud Filium gratia et potestate valet, ut majorem nec humana nec angelica natura assecuta unquam sit, aut assequi possit. Cumque suave Ipsi ac jucundum apprime sit, singulos suam flagitantes opem juvare ac solari; dubitandum non est, quin Ecclesiæ universæ votis adnuere multo libentius velit ac propemodum gestiat.

Hæc autem tam magna et plena spei in augustam cælorum Reginam pietas luculentius emicuit, cum errorum vis late serpentium, vel exundans morum corruptio, vel potentium adversariorum impetus militantem Dei Ecclesiam in discrimen adducere visa sunt. Veteris et recentioris ævi historiæ, ac sanctiores Ecclesiæ fasti publicas priva-

tasque ad Deiparam obsecrations et vota commemorant, ac vicissim præbita per Ipsam auxilia partamque divinitus tranquillitatem et pacem. Hinc insignes illi tituli, quibus Eam catholicæ gentes christianorum Auxiliatricem, Opiferam, Solatricem, bellorum Potentem, Victricem, Paciferam consularunt. Quos inter præcipue commemorandus solemnis ille ex Rosario ductus, quo insignia Ipsius in universum christianum nomen beneficia ad perpetuitatem consecrata sunt. Nemo vestrum ignorat, Venerabiles Fratres, quantum laboris et luctus, sæculo duodecimo exeunte, sanctæ Dei Ecclesie intulerint Albigenses hæretici, qui recentiorum Manichæorum secta progeniti, australi Gallia plagam atque alias latini orbis regiones perniciosis erroribus repleverant; armorumque terrorem circumferentes, late dominari per clades et ruinas moliebantur. Contra hujusmodi terroris hostes virum sanctissimum, ut nostis, excitavit misericors Deus, inclitum scilicet Dominiciani Ordinis parentem et conditorem. Is integritate doctrinæ, virtutum exemplis, munera apostolici perfunctione magnus, pugnare pro Ecclesia catholica excuso animo aggressus est, non vi, non armis, sed ea maxime precatione confisus, quam sacri Rosarii nomine ipse primus instituit, et per se, per suos alumnos longe lateque disseminavit. Dei enim instinctu ac numine sentiebat futurum, ut ejus precationis ope, tamquam validissimo instrumento bellico, victi hostes profligatique vesanam impietate audaciam ponere cogerentur. Quod re ipsa evenisse compertum est. Etenim ea orandi ratione suscepta riteque celebrata ex institutione Dominicæ Patris, pietas, fides, concordia restitui, hæreticorum molitiones atque artes disjici passim cepero; ad hæc, plurimi errantes ad sanitatem revocati, et catholicorum armis, quæ fuerant ad vim propulsandam sumpta, impiorum compressus furor.

Eiusdem precationis efficacitas et vis mirabiliter etiam perspecta est sæculo decimo sexto, cum ingentes Turcarum copiæ Europa prope universæ superstitionis et barbaricæ jugum intentarent. Quo tempore sanctus Pius V. Pontifex Maximus, excitatis ad communium rerum tutelam principibus christianis, omni studio in primis egit ut potentissima Mater Dei, per Rosarii preces implorata, nomini christiano volens propitia succurreret. Nobilissimum sane spectaculum per eos dies celo terraque exhibuit omnium in se mentes animosque convertit. Hinc enim Christi fideles non procul a Corinthiaco sinu vitam et sanguinem pro religionis patriæque incolumitate fundere parati, hostem interriti opperiebantur; illinc inermes pio supplicantum agmine, Mariam in clamabant, Mariani ex Rosarii formula iteratis vicibus consalutabant, ut certantibus adesset ad victoriam. Adstitit exorata Domina; nam commisso ad Echinadas insulas navaliter prælio, christianorum classis, sine magna suorum clade, fusis cæsisque hostibus, magnifice vicit. Quare idem sanctissimus Pontifex in accepti beneficii memoriam, anniversarium tanti certaminis diem honori Mariæ Victricis festum haberi voluit: quem Gregorius XIII. titulo Rosarii consecravit.

Simili modo, superiore sæculo, semel ad Temesvariam in Pannonia, semel ad Coreyram insulam nobilis est de Turcarum copiis victoria

reportata: idque sacris Magnæ Virgini diebus, precibusque pio Rosarii ritu ante persolutis. Quæ res Clementem XI. Decessorem Nostrum adduxit ut grati animi ergo, solemnem Deiparæ a Rosario honorem quontannis habendum tota Ecclesia decreverit.

Igitur cum sacra hæc precandi formula tantopere Virgini grata esse dignoscatur, eaque ad Ecclesiæ populique christiani defensionem et ad divina beneficia publice privatiisque impetranda apprime conferat; mirum non est, eximiis eam præconis alios quoque Decessores Nostros efferre atque augere studuisse. Sic Urbanus IV. *quotidie per Rosarium christiano populo bona provenire testatus est.* Sixtus IV. hunc orandi ritum *ad honorem Dei et Virginis, et ad imminentia mundi pericula propulsanda opportunum;* Leo X. *adversus hæresiarchas et gliscentes hæreses institutum,* et Julius III. *Romanæ Ecclesiæ decorem dixerunt.* Itemque de eo sanctus Pius V., *hoc, inquit, orandi modo evulgato, ceppisse fideles iis meditationibus accensos, iis precibus inflammatos, in alios viros repente mutari, hæresum tenebras remitti, et lucem catholicae fidei aperiri.* Demum Gregorius XIII. *Rosarium a beato Dominico ad iram placandam et Beatae Virginis intercessionem implorandum fuisse institutum.*

Hac Nos cogitatione exemplisque Decessorum Nostrorum permoti, opportunum omnino consenserunt hoc tempore *supplications* ob eam caussam institui, ut invocata per Rosarii preces Virgine augusta *parem necessitatibus opem* a Jesu Christo ejus Filio impetremus. Perspicitis, Venerabiles Fratres, Ecclesiæ labores dimicationsque diurnas et graves. Christianam pietatem, publicam morum honestatem, fidemque ipsam, quæ summum est bonum virtutumque ceterarum principium, majoribus quotidie periculis videmus oppositam. Item difficile conditionem variosque angores Nostros non modo cognoscitis, sed facit caritas vestra ut quadam Nobiscum societate et communione sentiatis. Miserrimum autem est, ac longe luctuosissimum, tot animas Jesu Christi sanguine redemptas, quodam aberrantis sæculi veluti correptas turbine, præcipites in pejus agi atque in interitum ruere sempiternum. Igitur divini necessitas auxiliis haud sane est hodie minor, quam cum magnus Dominicus ad publica sananda vulnera Marialis Rosarii usum invexit. Ille vero cælesti pervidit lumine, etatis suæ malis remedium nullum præsentius futurum, quam si homines ad Christum, qui *via veritas et vita* est, salutis per Eum nobis parta crebra commentatione rediissent; et Virginem illam, cui datum est *cunctas hæreses interimere*, deprecaticem apud Deum adhibuerint. Idecirco sacri Rosarii formulam ita composuit, ut et salutis nostræ mysteria ordine recolentur, et huic meditandi officio mysticum innecteretur sertum ex angelica salutatione contextum, interjecta oratione ad Deum et Patrem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi. Nos igitur haud absimili malo idem querentes remedium, non dubitamus, quin eadem hæc a beatissimo viro tanto cum orbis catholici emolumento inducta precatio, momenti plurimum habitura sit ad levandas nostrorum quoque temporum calamitates.

Quamobrem non modo universos christianos enixe hortamur, ut vel publice vel privatim in sua quisque domo et familia pium hoc Rosarii

officium peragere studeant et non intermissa consuetudine usurpent, sed etiam **INTEGRUM ANNI LABENTIS OCTOBREM MENSEM** caelesti Reginas a Rosario sacrum dicatumque esse volumus. Decernimus itaque et mandamus, ut in orbe catholico universo hoc item anno solemnia Deiparæ a Rosario peculiari religione et cultus splendore celebrentur; utque a prima die proximi octobris ad secundam subsequentis novembris, in omnibus ubique curialibus templis, et si Ordinarii locorum utile atque opportunum judicaverint, in aliis etiam templis sacrariis honoris Deiparæ dedicatis, *quinque saltem Rosarii decades, adjectis Litanis Lauretanis religiose recitentur*: optamus autem ut ad has preces convenienti populo, eodem tempore vel sacrum ad altare fiat, vel Sacramento augusto ad adorandum proposito, sacrosancta deinceps hostia pius supplicantum ceteris rite lustretur. Magnopere probamus, sodalitates a Rosario Virginis solemnni pompa vicatim per urbes, accepta a majoribus consuetudine, publicæ religionis caussa procedere. Quibus autem in locis id injuria temporum forte non licet, quidquid publicæ religioni ex hac parte detractum est, frequentiore redimatur ad sacras aedes accursu; et diligentiore virtutum christianarum exercitatione fervor pietatis eluceat.

Eorum autem gratia, qui quæ supra jussimus facturi sunt, libet caelestis Ecclesiae thesauros recludere, in quibus ipsi incitamenta simul et præmia pietatis inveniant. Omnibus igitur qui intra designatum temporis spatium, Rosarii cum Litanis publicæ recitationi interfuerint, et ad mentem Nostram oraverint, septem annorum itemque septem quadragenarum apud Deum indulgentiam singulis vicibus obtainendam concedimus. Quo beneficio frui pariter posse volumus, quos supplicationibus publicis supra dictis legitima caussa prohibeat, hac tamen lege ut eidem sacrae exercitationi privatim operam dederint, itemque Deo ad mentem Nostram supplicaverint. Eos vero qui supra dicto tempore decies saltem, vel publice in sacris templis, vel justas ob caussas privatis in domibus eadem peregerint et, expiatis rite animis, sacra de altari libaverint, piaculo omni et statis admissorum poenitentia ad pontificalis indulgentiæ modum exsolvimus. Plenissimam hanc admissorum suorum veniam omnibus etiam elargimur, qui vel in ipsis beatæ Marie Virginis a Rosario solemnibus, vel quolibet ex octo consequentibus diebus, abluti pariter salutari confessione animis, ad Christi mensam accesserint, et in aliqua aede sacra pro Ecclesiæ necessitatibus ad mentem Nostram Deo et Deiparæ rite supplicaverint.

Agite vero, Venerabiles Fratres, quantum Vobis curæ est et Mariæ honos et societatis humanæ salus, tantum studeate populorum in Magnam Virginem alere pietatem, augere fiduciam. Divino quidem munere factum putamus, ut, vel turbulentissimis hisce Ecclesiae temporibus, in maxima christiani populi parte stet ac vigeat antiqua in augustam Virginem religio et pietas. Nunc vero exhortationibus his Nostris excitatae, vestrisque vocibus incensæ christianæ gentes vehementiore in dies animi ardore sese in Mariæ tutelam fidemque recipiant; et ad amare magis ac magis insistant Marialis Rosarii consuetudinem, quam majores nostri non modo uti præsens in malis auxilium, sed etiam nobilis instar tesserae christianæ pietatis habere consueverunt.

Obsecrationes concordes ac supplices libens excipiet humani generis Patrona cœlestis, illudque facile impetrabit, ut boni virtutis laude crescant; ut devii sese ad salutem colligant ac resipiscant; ut vindex scelerum Deus ad clementiam ac misericordiam conversus rem christianam remque publicam, amotis periculis, optatæ tranquillitati restituat.

Hac spe erecti, Deum ipsum, per Eam in qua totius boni posuit plenitudinem, summis animi Nostri votis enixe obsecramus, ut maxima quæque Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, cœlestium bonorum munera largiatur: in quorum auspicio et pignus, Vobis ipsis et Clero vestro et populis cuiusque vestrum curæ concreditis, Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum die 1 Septembris, a. 1883. Pontificatus Nostri Anno Sexto.

LEO PP. XIII.



## Science Notices.

---

**Recent Progress in Electricity.**—Our neighbours *d'outre mer* have succeeded in scoring a success over us in the matter of an electrically moved tramcar. In Paris, but a few weeks ago, thirty English miles were run in about three hours by such a car. The motive power is stored up in some fifty hundredweight of secondary batteries connected with a Siemens' machine placed beneath the car of the tram. The gradients which proved so fatal to the success of the first English experiment of the same nature were taken with ease by the French machine. The average speed on such inclines as are to be found in Paris was about six miles an hour. On the level it was not difficult to make as much as ten miles an hour. It is a matter of no small importance to note that the appearance of such a strange moving machine had little or no disturbing effect upon the horses in the street. It has always been held that the apparition of self-moved carriages in our highways would throw every horse into a paroxysm of fright, and form an almost fatal objection to the introduction of such machines. It is well that the groundless nature of such alarms should be pointed out. Investors in Liverpool tram companies will take heart at these glad tidings, since the cost of an electric tram will certainly not average the half of that necessitated by the costly purchase and maintenance of horses. Our readers will observe how steadily the secondary battery is working its way in public estimation for economical and efficient work.

We cannot congratulate ourselves on the progress made by electric lighting amongst us. It is not gratifying to know that we are far behind in this matter; not only other European capitals, but that every brand new town in America outshines us. The companies lay the blame on the vestries, the vestries retort that the companies are trying to obtain possession of tyrannous monopolies. There can be no doubt that our companies have overweighted themselves by the purchase of patents. When once a company has been fairly started on its way, it cannot afford to be barred by some new process which threatens to run it off the lines. Such a process must be purchased at any price. Many of these patents have proved to be worthless, many have been superseded, and the shares of the companies are weighed down by unproductive capital. It is not pleasant to anticipate that there must be more desolation among electric lighting shares before any real advance can be made. Not before rights and patents have come to be a glut in the market, purchasable at nominal prices, can we hope to make any real progress in electric lighting.

**The Palestine Canal.**—It is a little surprising that the reli-

gious world has not lifted its voice and raised a serious protest against the proposed desecration of the Holy Land. There has been more than one scare before about this same project, but the company that is started to let the waters of the Mediterranean into the Jordan Valley are really in earnest now. It is high time that those to whom the ground whereon our Lord trod is holy, should not allow those places associated with his life upon earth to be destroyed to make profit for the British shareholder. The scheme in short is this. It has long been known that the Dead Sea is some 1,300 feet below the Mediterranean. Into this depression the whole valley of the Jordan slopes down from beyond the sea of Galilee. It is proposed to take advantage of this natural depression by connecting it by means of canals with the Mediterranean on the one hand, and with the Red Sea on the other, thus forming an alternative passage with the Suez Canal to India. This will give an inland sea of about 200 miles, varying in breadth from three to ten miles, and capable of floating vessels of the largest size. The canal from the Mediterranean will enter at the foot of Mount Carmel, and, leaving Nazareth on the left, will be continued through the plain of Esdrelon. The waters will then mingle with those of the river Jordan, and a disastrous flooding will at once ensue—Emmaus, Tiberias, Bethsaida, and Capharnaum will all be engulfed beneath the deluge, and Jerusalem become a seaport town. Three hundred square miles of land will be sacrificed, and the inhabitants are to be induced to submit to exile by the temptation of a large monetary compensation. The project is dazzling enough, and our engineers would put up with no restraint were there not, we are thankful to say, one very considerable difficulty in the way. From the Mediterranean to the Red Sea, the works would be only too easy, and the wholesale destruction of the Holy Places only too complete, but the tract of land between the Dead and Red Seas will prove an almost insurmountable obstacle. The country has never been explored, no European has ventured to cross it. It abounds with scorpions and Bedouins of the most intractable type. That it is a howling wilderness of sand, we know, but of the formation upon which the sand rests we are profoundly ignorant. Should it prove to be rock our speculators will hesitate before they think of boring 100 miles of such intractable material. Nor would it be absurd to assume that there will be rock. At the southern shore there is a low-lying ridge of red sandstone; there is also evidence of considerable volcanic disturbance in the whole neighbourhood. It is true that there is a considerable tract of marshy land at this southern border, but even upon porous rocks like the Red Sandstone bogs are frequent on account of the sand becoming cemented into a hard mass by means of oxide of iron, thus forming an impenetrable pan. The probabilities therefore of encountering rock are by no means small. There are few earnest Christians that do not fervently hope that such may be the case. It is hard to listen to the encomium that is lavished on this project, of its safety, its economy, its security. We have only one wish in its regard. It is that his Grace the Duke and the other noble promoters may be compelled ere

long to record their verdict of the affair in Burke's striking words, "*Opposuit natura.*"

**Thought Reading.**—There has been much speculation of late as to the genuineness of the claim put forward by Mr. Bishop to the possession of certain powers in the way of reading other people's thoughts. It would seem, however, that Mr. Bishop has hardly succeeded in convincing the public that he is not a very superior sort of conjuror. That persons have been known to be possessed of some such gifts seems to be well-established. A most remarkable case of the sort is given in a paper in the *Journal of Psychological Medicine*. The case, unlike many another, was submitted to every conceivable test, but no failure was exhibited.

Mrs. Croad was totally blind, deaf, and speechless. In this state she developed most extraordinary powers which attracted the attention of her medical men. The sense of sight seemed to be transferred from her eyes to the tips of her fingers. Cards, photographs, and writings were presented to her, and all were deciphered by means of a rapid passage of the fingers over the object. More remarkable still was the power of appreciating and accurately describing the colours of the different pictures put before her. The most minute precautions were taken to prevent any trickery or delusion. Her eyes were carefully bandaged, the room darkened, and yet the finger tips seemed still to possess their mysterious power. Her perception of the most minute and apparently insignificant details was most startling. Seldom or never was she at fault.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the case was the manner in which the daughter, Miss Croad, conversed with her mother. It seemed to be only necessary for these two to join hands, and communications at once passed between the two. This seemed to be almost beyond belief, but one of the doctors in attendance, Dr. Davey, received in his own person a very startling proof of Mrs. Croad's mysterious powers. She asked him if he would object to her declaring a secret of his past life. The doctor consented. She thereupon wrote down upon a slate some private and personal convictions of the doctor's which could have been known to no other human being.

To us Catholics such phenomena are familiar enough in the Lives of the Saints. It is now our turn to smile and remark the discomfiture of those self-satisfied minds who have been contending for so many years that such powers are quite impossible since they are contrary to the laws of Nature.

**Magnetism and Conscience.**—While on the subject of these mysterious states, it may be well to draw attention to a very remarkable paper by Dr. Desplats, of the Catholic Faculty of Lille, published in the *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*. The utterances of the Holy See on the question of the use of Magnetism have been very guarded. But all right-minded men have been extremely suspicious of mesmerism, and considered its practice fraught with danger. It has been felt that the absolute power which the operator obtains over the subject was liable to very serious abuse. Dr. Desplats maintains

that the influence of the magnetizer has been very greatly exaggerated. We must not think, he says, that the patient yields up his conscience as he does his sight, hearing, and the rest; on the contrary, he then resists with more energy than in the wakeful state. De Puységur says in his *Mémoires*: "The empire which is acquired over susceptible persons can be exercised only in those matters which concern their health and general welfare; or in those things that are innocent in themselves, as in walking, singing, and the rest; but there are certain limits at which this power ceases, and the magnetized know well these limits." He then cites the case of a patient whom he ordered to sign away a large sum of money. To his astonishment the subject absolutely refused. The doctor urged and impressed his commands, when the patient uttered these remarkable words: "You can only command me to a certain point; if you press me further, *I shall wake up.*"

Other authorities are invoked to prove that the somnambulists not only preserve their free will, but that their conscience is more delicate during sleep than in their wakeful moments, and that they judge their actions in a calmer and more disinterested manner.

These remarks will sound strange and suspicious to many of our readers. Be the matter as it may, Dr. Desplats will admit that a clever and villainous magnetizer might easily deceive his subject. But a very grave objection to practise Animal Magnetism still remains—that its too frequent application to a patient not only may result in serious injuries, but almost invariably leaves behind some organic mischief.

**The American Association of Science.**—Our cousins over the Atlantic are just rising from their labours as our own Association is settling down upon Southport. The characteristics and objects of the two Associations are very much alike. Brother Jonathan, if anything, is somewhat more practical in his scientific views, and is rather intolerant of the high and dry science that will not lend itself to some profitable invention. There was, however, one address that we could wish to be better known. It was that of Principal Dawson, no less known for his geological discoveries as for his fearless and loyal defence of Christian truths. Its title was "Some Unsolved Problems in Geology." Dr. Dawson drew attention to some of the formidable difficulties in the way of the new theories of the formation of the earth and the origin of life that science is apt to make too light of. While admitting the brilliancy and attractiveness of the Darwinian theory of evolution, he reminds us that, while the direct proofs of the theory are few, the gaps in the chain are very many indeed. The results of the *Challenger* expedition again have shown us that the great ocean beds have certain marked and permanent features which seriously threaten to upset all hitherto received geological theories of the formation of the earth. The recent views of ice action have been pushed to extremes little short of ridiculous, and the glacial epoch is as mysterious as ever.

*Scientia inflat* was said of old, and the saying was never more true of any generation than of our own. It is the intolerable air of superiority and self-sufficiency that cast such discredit upon modern

science, as if scientists could weigh everything in their balance, and as if there were few things in heaven and earth not dreamed of in their philosophy. It is only by carefully considering what a very insignificant portion of the world of Nature they have conquered, and what vast tracts yet remained sealed and unexplored, that we are enabled to see how hollow are the claims to confidence and belief that are put forward on behalf of modern science.

---

## Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

---

### FRENCH PERIODICALS.

*Le Muséon, Revue Internationale*, Tome II. Nos. 1, 2, 3.  
Louvain, 1883.

THE *Muséon* was started at the beginning of last year, under the direction of Professor C. de Harlez as an international scientific and literary review. Its next issue will complete its second year of existence, and one has now, therefore, sufficient ground for judging of its real excellence and recommending it accordingly. Each of its quarterly numbers of some hundred and sixty pages has been the medium for contributions from men of every variety of profession and nationality upon their special topics. Their names alone are a criterion for the value of their articles, whilst the Review is Catholic, in this further and very important signification that the editor—the well-known and earnest professor of Louvain—will guard its pages against anything offensive to religion, whilst holding it open to respectful discussion on debateable scientific ground. The pages of the new Review are to be devoted chiefly to such subjects as archæology, philology, "linguistique," law, philosophy, literature, &c. Professor de Harlez's name is a guarantee that Oriental students will find here a large share of interesting articles. It is fair, however, to remark that the director very wisely does not allow any one class of communications to preponderate. Other names, well known in scientific circles on the Continent, have already been contributors, chiefly Belgian, French, German, and Russian. Professor Sayce is thus far the only English contributor, but judging from the high character and value of the Review, we expect to see in due time papers from other professors of every nationality, a long list of whose names, as promised contributors, adorns the cover of the magazine.

"Was Cyrus King of Persia or of Susiana?" is the title of one or two articles, and indicates the subject of some others to which we will briefly advert. The discussion to which they give expression is

interesting, apart from its subject-matter; for the discussion really amounts to this important scientific problem—how soon should long-recognized historic statements lose their value because of discoveries that themselves rest on incomplete proof? Some two years ago certain cuneiform texts discovered in the excavations at Babylon were sent to this country. These inscriptions, having been translated, are asserted to have revolutionized that portion of Oriental history which centres round the figure of Cyrus the Great. A cylinder—the first translated—showed “two startling facts;” “firstly, that Cyrus was a polytheist, who so far from treating the deities of Babylonia with disrespect, restored and beautified their shrines, took part in their religious ceremonies, and subscribed himself their humble adorer; and secondly, that he and his three immediate predecessors were not Kings of Persia at all, but of Ansan or Anzan, the native name of the country known to the Assyrians and Hebrews as Elam, and to the Greeks and Romans as Susiana. The theory which saw in Cyrus a perfervid Zoroastrian, bent on destroying the idols of polytheism, had to be given up on the evidence of the king himself.” That is to say the cylinder inscription is a proclamation of Cyrus himself. We have his immediate testimony also in a clay tablet, since translated, in which he gives an account of his conquest of Babylon. In this tablet “Cyrus is again entitled ‘King of Ansan’ or Susiana, and his overthrow of Istuvegu or Astyages and the Median kingdom is dated in the year 549 B.C.” This we borrow from Professor Sayce’s own summary of the discovery, in the July *Contemporary*. The point at which the continental orientalists join issue may also be best expressed in his own words, in the same place: “the revelations of the cuneiform texts are borne out by such scanty contemporaneous evidence as has otherwise come down to us.”

In the April number of 1882, Professor de Harlez led the way, in the pages of the *Muséon*, by a short but pithy article, “Cyrus était-il roi de Perse?” in which he maintained that Oriental history had not to be re-written because of the discoveries but only completed; that Cyrus and his three predecessors remain kings of Persia, with the added titles of Kings of Anzan; that Cyrus was not a Zoroastrian, as was not Persia either in his time. The writer regards it as uncritical that all the well-attested evidence hitherto accepted should be summarily branded as apocryphal to make way for two inscriptions by an anonymous author, of which neither origin nor object is known.

To this Professor Sayce replied in the October number of the same year, insisting that whatever of the long-accepted evidence was truly contemporaneous lent itself to the new statement. The testimony of Ktesias is now set against that of Herodotus. Immediately following this letter, Professor de Harlez replied to the special points raised by Professor Sayce, thus leaving the question still one of debatable evidence. Although Professor de Harlez and other continental orientalists think Professor Sayce’s opinion unproved, we expect to find in the next history that is “up to date,” that as a matter of fact, Cyrus was not a Persian, &c. In the number for January of the present

year, M. Halévy, who shares the views of Professor Sayce, defends himself against M. Ernest Babelon, who had called in question his statements in the *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*, of January, 1882; whilst in the same number Professor Sayce writes that a third inscription, on a cylinder of Nabonidos, which gives an account of the defeat of Astyagés by Cyrus, confirms the "revolutionary" evidence of the two former inscriptions, calling the Cyrus "King of Ansan." A third letter appears from Père Delattre, S.J., who claims, on the testimony of cylindrical evidence of Sennacherib, that Anzan is distinct from Elam.

The April number brings a concluding word from both M. Halévy and Professor de Harlez; and the July number an article from the pen of Père Dellatre, S.J., "Cyrus d'après une nouvelle méthode historique," in which the writer deals summarily with the theories of M. Halévy. In these articles, probably all is said that can at present be advanced on one side or the other, in a dispute where so much is archaic, obscure, and incomplete.

---

#### GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Dr. BELLESHEIM, Cologne.

##### 1. *Katholik.*

PROFESSOR POHLE, of Leeds Seminary, continues his study of the system of F. Angelo Secchi, S.J., the great Roman astronomer. He urges on the reader's attention two important laws of Nature, the law of conservation of energy, and the law of change of heat into energy and of energy into heat. He examines the important conclusion to be drawn from the alleged laws—viz., the end to which one day the universe will be brought, since, according to the formulas established by Clausius and Thomson, the law of dissipation of energy is not less certain than the law of its conservation. The July number contains an able article—the result of extensive Biblical studies—on the seven deacons of the Acts. Twenty years ago Professor Döllinger, in the first edition of "Christianity and the Church in the First Ages," tried to establish a rather new opinion; he thought that the deacons of the Acts were not really deacons, but rather priests, the office and order of diaconate still being included in the priesthood. This opinion, though advocated with much learning, was soon objected to, as conflicting with the current doctrine of Catholic theologians. The article under notice is, however, very successful in establishing the common Catholic opinion, which holds to the institution of deacons who were not priests, whose proper function (the service of the tables) was inferior to that of the priesthood, whilst, on the contrary, the dignity of priesthood was still included in the apostleship. And it is only what one might have supposed, that the *inferior* offices of new ecclesiastical magistrates were first introduced, and that later the

priesthood, whose function is the administration of sacraments, came into separate existence when the Apostles had passed away.

In the same issue Dr. Falk furnishes a supplement to Janssen's celebrated "History of the German People from the End of the Middle Ages." Much testimony conspires to prove that the office of preaching was not in the least neglected, or even despised in the period immediately preceding the Reformation. That it was neglected is a calumny on the Church which is constantly being repeated, and especially this year of the solemn celebration of Luther's birthday. Far from being neglected, the office of preaching the Word of God was duly attended to, as all but innumerable decrees of German diocesan synods show. Many foundations still in existence also give equal evidence of the zeal of clergy and esteem of a faithful people. The Church did not let pass unemployed any means which might serve to imbue the faithful in Christian doctrine. Hence tables, having the Ten Commandments, Pater-Noster, and Ave-Maria inscribed, were hung on the church walls, and not seldom one meets with symbolical representations of either a mystery, or an institution of the church, or a momentous fact of ecclesiastical history. As examples, we may cite the Cathedral of Merseburg, and the Town Hall of Wittenberg, the very stronghold where Lutheranism originated. Large paintings were restored in 1516, which represent the Ten Commandments.

The same July number of the *Katholik* contains an account of Dr. Hippler's recently-published "Memoirs of the Bishop of Ermland, Prince Joseph of Hohenzollern." Sprung from the Catholic branch of the Hohenzollern family, and a relative of the royal family, Prince Joseph entered the ecclesiastical career, and in course of time was appointed Bishop of Ermland in 1818. From his untiring zeal in promoting the interests of the Catholic Church, his unselfish and mortified life, and strong vindication of the Church against any encroachment of the temporal power, he won the admiration and love of German Catholics. It was these excellent qualities that prompted Pius VII. to appoint the prince-bishop executor of the Bull, "De salute animarum," by which the Pope restored the Catholic hierarchy in Prussia in 1821. The bishop went to his eternal reward in 1837. Another biography is that of Mgr. Gasser, Prince-Bishop of Brixen in the Tyrol, who was called to a prominent part in framing the decree of the infallible "magisterium" of the Pope.

Lastly, I may mention an article in the August issue on "The so-called Nestorian Christology of Pelagius." There cannot be any doubt of the striking connection between the errors of Pelagius and Nestorius. But another question is, whether Pelagius himself was conscious of the ultimate conclusions originating in his false system of Christian grace, and whether he himself fell into errors concerning the union of the two natures in our Lord. The writings in which S. Augustine refuted Pelagius render it more than probable that Pelagius himself, though tainted with rationalism like Nestorius, was orthodox in his Christology. But the priest, Leporius, an eager disciple of Pelagius, did what his master had left undone, by dissolving

the unity of our Lord's person. Yet what must be admitted to have been only a transient error in the Western Church, took deep roots and developed into a dangerous system in the East. This is the opinion of Cardinal Hergenroether and Bishop Hefele, and the present article in the *Katholik* is a powerful confirmation of it.

2. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*.—The exiled German Jesuit fathers are displaying wonderful activity in the development of Catholic theology, and the vindication of religion and the Church against the assaults either of modern natural science, or of the atheistic bureaucratic state system. In the July number, Dr. Ehrle treats of the new school of S. Bonaventure. The old Franciscan school began with Alexander of Hales, and had its terminus in S. Bonaventure. Subsequently came a period in which the "doctor subtilis," Duns Scotus, took the leadership amongst the several branches of the Franciscan order. But already, in 1500, the chapter held at Terni deemed it necessary to point out that "non omnis ad acumina Scotti idoneus est." Indeed, only a comparatively few scholars might be found able to follow the acute, but obscure, ideas of Scotus. The Franciscans in our time are striving to bring into prominence their first doctors, of whom S. Bonaventure takes precedence. In another article, F. Schneemann presents us with a large number of documents referring to the long contests between the electors of Brandenburg, afterwards kings of Prussia, and the archbishops of Cologne, concerning the exercise of the episcopal jurisdiction of the latter in the territory subject to the former. The documents refer to the Duchy of Cleves, and are the more important that they were not inserted in an official collection published by command of the Government some years ago. An interesting article is contributed by F. Kreiten on Annette of Droste-Huelshoff, the German poetess. She was a thorough Catholic; and as to beauty of language, vastness of ideas, by far surpassed any poetess Germany has produced.

3. *Historisch-politische Blätter*.—The number for July contains a criticism of F. Dressel's, S.J., book, "Der belebte und der unbelebte Stoff nach den neuesten Forschungen," and refutes the system of Monism, which threatens to rival Pantheism. In the September number is traced forcibly the history of the Turkish wars waged in the course of centuries against Germany, and mainly the invasions of 1529 and 1683. The second centenary of the last invasion having just been solemnly kept all over Austria, the author of the article does not fail to advert to the signal merit of the Popes, who as common fathers of Christendom, strove to unite the forces of Christian princes against the formidable enemy of the Christian name. Alas! that the false policy of Francis II. and his successors on the French throne, and the resistance of German Protestants, who held the Papacy in utmost detestation, spoiled these efforts of the supreme Pontiffs. Had it not been for the incapacity of Kara Mustapha, Vienna in 1683 would have fallen a prey to the Turk. Divine Providence happily averted such a disaster.

4. *Historisches Jahrbuch der Goerres-Gesellschaft*.—In the July

number, F. Diekamp concludes his papers on recent literature on Papal diplomacy. The writer treats fully the contributions of Delisle, and Sickel; he dwells particularly on the several changes introduced in Papal documents from the middle of the eleventh century. I would wish that English Catholic divines availed themselves of this treatise, as it systematically brings forward the praiseworthy exertions made now-a-days in Germany and France in investigating, collecting, and editing Papal documents, hitherto stored up in the darkness of libraries. For centuries the Holy See has been the most influential power in Europe, and any documents testifying to its exertions in establishing or extending Christianity claim our most earnest attention. I must not fail to mention here that a second edition of "Saffé, *Regesta Romanorum Pontificum*" is now in the course of publication. In the same July number, Professor Dittrich, of the Lyceum Hosianum at Braunsberg, treats of the accounts sent from the Diet of Ratisbon, 1541, by the Papal legate, Giovanni Morone, to Cardinal Farnese, Secretary of State to Paul III. He has copied them from the secret archives of the Vatican, and for the most part they are now published for the first time. These despatches throw new light on the plans of German princes at the critical time. Clement VII., and not less Paul III., have been severely reprimanded for not totally adopting and advocating the plans of Charles V. The latter, although thoroughly Catholic, was not free from autocracy, and Morone's letters give an idea of what might have been expected from Charles V. had he overcome all resistance. The Archbishop Elector of Mainz told the nuncio: "I believe he strives to make the Pope and ourselves his chaplains."

---

#### ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

*La Civiltà Cattolica.* 7 Luglio. 4 Agosto. 1883.

*The Last Babylonian King.*

THE *Civiltà Cattolica* continues its series of articles with reference to the light which recently discovered cuneiform inscriptions have thrown upon the history of Assyrian and Babylonian kings. The number for July 7th contains one entitled, "The Last Babylonian King," and in the number for the 4th of August we have "the King of Baltassar of Daniel." Modern rationalists, always on the watch to invalidate the testimony of Scripture, have denied the existence of a king of this name at the time when Cyrus captured Babylon, and, as a consequence, have relegated to the rank of a fable the account of the mysterious handwriting on the wall upon that fatal night, as recorded by the Hebrew prophet. Profane historians of antiquity, in fact, give to the last king of Babylon the name of Nabonid. Jewish and Christian commentators have endeavoured to remove this apparent discrepancy by various more or less plausible conjectures, admissible previous to the clear light afforded by the inscriptions alluded to.

The two main questions which have furnished matter for debate are

these:—1. Whose son was Baltassar, and what was his title to reign? 2. In what manner can the narrative of Daniel be brought into harmony with what profane writers have stated about the fall of Babylon? Some would have had it that Nabonid and Baltassar are one and the same king, the former being possibly his official, the latter his personal name. Others, and among them St. Jerome, were led to infer that Nabonid was the son and legitimate successor of Laborosoarach, an assertion, however, which finds a direct contradiction in Abidenus, who denies that Nabonid had any blood-relationship with his predecessor, or other title to the throne but the consent of the grandees, his accomplices in the conspiracy against its occupant. With him the historian Berossus also agrees. We find full corroboration of this view in the inscriptions, which, moreover, give us the name of Nabonid's father, Nabu-balat-irib, who is qualified as "*potent-lord*," but to whom no regal title is ever attributed. The inscriptions also commemorate his mother, Nitocris (calling her, however, only "the mother of the king"), to whom many works and enterprises for the defence of the city are ascribed by Herodotus. Not a few Catholic interpreters of the sacred text would see in Baltassar the son of Evilmerodach, and thus the grandson of Nabuchodonosor, founding this opinion chiefly on Jeremias xxvii. 7: *Servient ei* (that is, Nabuchodonosor) *omnes gentes, et filio ejus* (Evilmerodach), *et filio filii ejus* (that is, Baltassar). Finally, Baltassar has been by some identified with Evilmerodach himself, in favour of which supposition it is alleged that Daniel invariably calls Baltassar "the son of Nabuchodonosor."

Now every one of these conjectures are swept away by modern discovery, and the irrefragable testimony of monumental stones, and in particular by that of the two great cylinders entitled respectively *Mugheir* and *Nabonid*, discovered in the year 1854, amongst the ruins of the Temple of Sin, by Taylor, the English Vice-Consul at Bassora, the latter cylinder being in a very shattered condition, sufficient, however, remaining to establish most important points, in conjunction with the cylinder of *Mugheir*. And, first, we observe in both cylinders a special notice by Nabonid of his first-born son, Bel-sar-ussur. After addressing the god Sin in prayer, "the lord of the gods, the king of the gods of heaven and of earth," and begging his favourable protection and the propagation of his worship, he adds, "and preserve me also, Nabu-nahid, King of Bab-Ilu, from sin against thy great divinity; grant me a long life even to distant days, and cause Bel-sar-ussur, the offshoot of my heart, my first-born son, to propagate the worship of thy great divinity; and may his life, exempt from sin, be prolonged to length of days." The inscription on the Nabonid cylinder is longer and fuller, and is divided into three columns; but owing to its mutilated condition there are many breaks, and much is lost to us. What remains is very valuable. Addressing the god Samas with many prayers, Nabonid here again says: "Because Nabu-nahid, King of Bab-Ilu, has not sinned against thy great divinity, his life shall be preserved. And Bel-sar-ussur, my first-born son, the offshoot of my heart, shall prolong his days until the completion of

his destinies." This Bel-sar-ussur, thrice named by Nabonid in this inscription as his first-born son, the offshoot or child of his heart, must be the celebrated Baltassar of Daniel. But it will be objected, if so, how is it that Daniel repeatedly calls Baltassar the son of Nabuchodonosor; and that, without noticing any intervening reigns, he proceeds at once, after relating the acts of Nabuchodonosor, to speak of Baltassar, as if he had been his immediate successor? Moreover, Jeremiah seems to call Baltassar Merodach, thus identifying him, in the opinion of some commentators, with Evilmerodach.

The writer meets these objections satisfactorily. As to Baltassar being called the son of Nabuchodonosor, this in itself can offer no difficulty to those who are familiar with oriental language and that of the Bible, persons being often therein styled the sons of those of whom they were but the grandsons or remoter descendants; and there seems cogent reason to believe, as will be presently shown, that Baltassar was related by blood to his great predecessor. In reply to the second objection, he says, we must remember that the prophet is not writing Babylonian annals, but notices only what is connected with his object, which is chiefly the record of his own visions and the interpretation of those sent to the Babylonian monarchs. Now, as the kings who succeeded Nabuchodonosor furnished him with no material to his purpose, he passes on to Baltassar. As for Jeremiah's words—*Capta est Babylon, confusus est Bel, victus est Merodach, confusa sunt sculptilia eius, superata sunt idola eorum*—it is manifest, that the *Merodach* as well as the *Bel* of the prophet are simply the two principal gods and idols of Babylon, Belo and Marduk, so often named in the inscriptions. Besides, were this interpretation admitted, what would become of that other prophecy of Jeremias, that people should serve Nabuchodonosor's son and his grandson also? Again, not only would the reign of Evilmerodach be set aside or merged in that of Baltassar, but the reigns of Neriglissor, Laborosoarchod, and Nabonid must be cancelled, in defiance of the testimony of so many ancient historians and of the recently discovered cuneiform inscriptions, where authentic and coeval record is preserved of all these kings, except of Laborosoarchod, who reigned but nine months. Besides, is it credible that, had Baltassar been Nabuchodonosor's actual son, he should have been so ignorant of Daniel, who held so important a governmental post during his father's lifetime, or of his prophetic gifts, as not to think of him when he summoned all the soothsayers to read the handwriting on the wall? whereas this oblivion becomes very intelligible if we hold that Baltassar did not come to the throne for a good number of years after Nabuchodonosor's death, for during this interval it would seem that Daniel lived far removed from the Court; so that, when he reappeared there, it is not wonderful that the king should address him as almost an unknown man, or at least as one of whom he had a very vague knowledge until refreshed by the queen-mother (chapter v. 14-16).

There seems every reason to believe that Baltassar never reigned alone, but had a colleague, namely, his own father. Nabonid reigned

seventeen years; and as Daniel, who was summoned from Susa to read the handwriting on the wall, speaks only of the third year of Baltassar, it is probable that this date referred to the time when Nabonid associated his son to his regal power and title. A small tablet of unbaked clay, having on both sides an inscription in cuneiform Assyrian Chaldean, was disinterred from the ruins of Babylon, and has been at the British Museum ever since 1879. Considering its very fragile material, it is wonderful that, out of eighty-four lines which it had originally contained, about fifty remain of which the sense can be made out with sufficient clearness. The text of the inscription is in the form of annals, in the style used by the Assyrian kings, and enumerates the chief events of the seventeen years of Nabonid's reign, and of the first year of Cyrus as king of Babylon. The writer gives the translation, and, reserving to another time a fuller commentary on its contents, he notices this much to his present purpose—viz., that this inscription strongly confirms the truth of what many learned men had already suspected from the tenure of the two cylinders of Mugheir and Nabonid, that Baltassar was associated in the sovereignty by his father, and that the title of king given him by Daniel truly belonged to him. Although the "son of the king" repeatedly mentioned in the tablet, though not by name, is not expressly called his father's colleague, yet so he appears from the facts to have been. We find him from the seventh year of Nabonid's reign at the head of the army, surrounded by the grandees of the empire, directing warlike operations, while the king is remaining quietly at Teva, as if he had made over the active cares of government to his son; and when the queen-mother (Nitocris), who was also with the army, dies, it is her grandson, the "son of the king," and not the king himself, upon whom naturally this duty would have devolved, who with the soldiers mourned her for three days. In short, the "king's son" is a more conspicuous personage on this tablet than his father, who seems never mentioned save to describe him as doing nothing. Now, such a state of things can hardly be explained, except by the supposition that Nabonid had assumed his first-born, for whom we have seen him so earnestly entreating the protection of his gods, into partnership, and had even committed to him the principal weight of government.

A remarkable confirmation of this view occurs in Scripture. From the text of Daniel we might almost necessarily conclude that Baltassar had a colleague in royalty; for when he wishes to offer to the interpreter of the mysterious writing on the wall the highest honour and reward which it was in his power to bestow, he promises him that he shall be clothed with purple, have a gold chain on his neck, and shall be the *third* in his kingdom;\* and again to the prophet he repeats the same words:† *Purpura vestieris, et torquem auream circa collum tuum habebis, et tertius in regno meo princeps eris.* But why the *third*, if Baltassar was sole and absolute monarch? In analogous cases occur-

\* Chapter v. 7.

† v. 16.

ring in Scripture, it is always the *second* in the kingdom that is spoken of. Thus, Mardocheus was proclaimed second to King Assuerus; Pharaon said to Joseph: *Uno tantum regni solio te præcedam*, and Nabuchodonosor practically placed Daniel in the same position, setting him as prince over all the provinces of Babylon. The only probable interpretation of the difference in the case of Baltassar is that he could not offer a place already occupied, he himself being the second king in rank, and his father the first.

It would still be needful to explain what title Baltassar had to be called the son of Nabuchodonosor, although, as has been observed, there would be no difficulty in its application to him if he were his grandson or even remoter descendant; but it would certainly not be easy to interpret satisfactorily the words of Daniel without some such supposition, for no less than five times is Baltassar expressly called the son of Nabuchodonosor in the fifth chapter of Daniel. The queen-mother addresses him as such, and he gives himself the same appellation, as does Daniel also. Now, it would hardly seem a gratuitous supposition to hold that Nabonid may have married one of Nabuchodonosor's daughters on his accession to the throne, as Neriglissor had done before him, if, indeed, he was not selected by the grandes for that position especially on account of his alliance with the great monarch. It was the common practice of oriental usurpers to endeavour to strengthen their position by a marriage connecting them with their predecessors, as Rawlinson has observed; and that such was the case with Nabonid may legitimately be inferred from the language of Holy Scripture, where Baltassar is invariably regarded as the son—that is, the descendant—of Nabuchodonosor, for the prophet Baruch also thus describes him.

The great inscription of Behistun furnishes another strong indication that Baltassar was a true descendant of Nabuchodonosor, for in it we find Darius I. reckoning, amongst other rebels with whom he had had to deal, two Babylonians who had both found favour with their countrymen by their false rallying-cry: "I am Nabuchodrossor, the son of Nabonid." Hence we learn that Nabonid, besides his first-born, Bel-sar-ussur, or Baltassar, had another son to whom he had given the name of Nabuchodrossor or Nabuchodonosor, which renders it highly probable that he had contracted with the royal race of Nabuchodonosor the Great the alliance in question, and had desired to renew in one of his sons the name of his famous grandfather, a name so glorious and dear to the Babylonians.

These two suppositions, which are shown to be highly probable from the unquestionable testimony of the monuments recently brought to light—viz., the relationship of Baltassar with Nabuchodonosor through his mother, and his association in regal dignity and power by his father—would go a long way towards reconciling the narrative of Daniel with all that remains to us with reference to Babylonian history in the works of ancient writers, whose statements have been quoted as entirely at variance with those of the inspired prophet.

## Notices of Books.

---

*De humanae cognitionis ratione anecdota quædam seraphici doctoris Sancti Bonaventurae et nonnullorum ejus discipulorum edita studio et cura PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura. Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi) prope Florentiam; ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae. 1883.*

SOON after the unexpected close of the Vatican Council the General of the Franciscans determined to bring out a new edition of S. Bonaventure's works. Two reasons of far-reaching importance prompted him to take this step: the extant editions were neither complete nor up to the standard of a critically correct text; and, secondly, S. Bonaventure has been so strongly appealed to, inside the Church, as a champion of certain modern philosophical theories, that an amended edition of his numerous writings might lead to certainty as to the holy doctor's teaching. Hence a special college, comprising the most eminent professors of the Franciscan school, was erected in Quaracchi, near Florence, and F. Fidelis a Fanna commissioned to investigate the most renowned libraries of Europe. He succeeded in this task in such a manner as to win for himself the admiration of all who are familiar with scholastic philosophy. In his "Ratio novæ collectionis operum omnium S. Bonaventurae" he laid down the results of his long and fatiguing scientific travels. Unfortunately Father Fidelis by a premature death was prevented from seeing the completion of the great work so auspiciously begun by him.

Amongst the multitude of documents gathered by the deceased Father there were not a few theological treatises, composed, some by S. Bonaventure himself, and others by several of the most able and influential of his immediate disciples. They have therefore a special interest and value towards forming a judgment on modern Ontologism; and as three mediaeval Englishmen figure among the writers, these treatises deserve in a special manner to be brought before the readers of this REVIEW.

The volume under notice starts with exhaustive notices on the MSS. which have supplied the texts, and a learned dissertation on the "Exemplarismus of the Scholastics," by F. Geiler. This Father shows that he is as familiar with scholastic philosophy, especially with S. Bonaventure, as any living divine. He boldly confronts modern Ontologism and vindicates S. Bonaventure from the charge of defending or teaching it. He expounds the mediæval doctrine at great length, pointing out that we perceive truth through divine light, but only indirectly, inasmuch as we perceive it through the medium of the natural light of reason. It cannot be denied that the seraphic Doctor, in his admirably profound writings claims a

very close influence of God on our reason, and he contends, too, that we are also aware of the effects of this illumination. But the Saint proves this doctrine to have been taught by S. Augustine; and F. Geiler (pp. 26-40) shows it to be in as full keeping with God's immediate concurrence to every human act, as defended by S. Thomas, as in opposition to Ontologism.

The "Anecdota" comprise; "S. Bonaventuræ questio disputata de cognitionis humanæ suprema ratione," and a "Sermo" on the text, "Unus est magister vester, Christus." Of S. Bonaventure's numerous disciples there appear Matthew ab Aquasparta, who became General of the Order, and afterwards cardinal. His "Quæstiones disputatae" deal with our cognition in the light of the supreme truth, our cognition of non-being, the possibility of a certain (sure) cognition, and the soul's cognition of itself. John Peckham, the celebrated Archbishop of Canterbury (1279-1292), contributes a "questio disputata," whether or not divine wisdom is to be considered as the ultimate cause of our knowledge. Fr. Eustachius, Papal Nuncio to Constantinople, and afterwards Bishop of Coutances, presents us with no less than three questions on the most sublime problems of psychology and metaphysics—viz., whether the soul in this life immediately sees God's wisdom; whether, whilst united with the body, she perceives substantial forms; and, lastly, whether the faculties of apprehending and loving are substantial or accidental to the soul. Roger Marston, the celebrated Oxford doctor, comments on the first of the aforesaid questions, but evidently more in accordance with S. Thomas than with S. Bonaventure. Last, but not least, appears Richard of Middletown, who treats the question, whether angels or men naturally recognize created truth in eternal wisdom. It is really wonderful to accompany these thoughtful writers through their closely reasoned pages. Compared with too many modern teachers of an erroneous philosophy, they are veritable giants, not merely by their possession of the truth, but by their grasp of principles, keenness of mental analysis, and wealth of argument.

BELLESHEIM.

*Les Premiers Jansénistes et Port Royal.* Par MGR. RICARD.  
Paris : E. Plon et Cie. 1883.

JANSENISM has not been fortunate in its historians. Honest and plodding P. Rapin, *Sainte-Beuve* with his five volumes in octavo, are by no means light reading, and the public has been inclined to vote the subject a dull one. It was Father Dalgairns, in the Introduction to his admirable little work on the Sacred Heart, who showed how the gloomy old story could be transformed into a bright and fascinating narrative. And now Mgr. Ricard, following in the wake of the great Oratorian, has consecrated some earnest and devoted work to the subject, and has produced a history of which we may fairly say that there is hardly a dull page from beginning

to end of some five hundred pages. Many an English reader, whose whole knowledge of Jansenism has been gained from F. Dalgairns's *Introduction*, has often been puzzled to know the exact grounds on which the Jansenists have been so persistently charged with systematic deceit and hypocrisy ; and they are still more at a loss to account for the fact that so gloomy, so Calvinistic a sect, should gain such a hold on the gay sons and daughters of Gaul. The first half of his work our author has devoted to these two questions, in which there is no lack of research and invective. But has he established his point, that the Jansenists were, above everything, dark unholy conspirators ? The impartial reader can hardly admit it. There is much abuse of the Abbé de S. Cyran ; every action of his is interpreted in a sinister sense ; hatred of the Jesuits is clearly shown to be the one fierce passion of the party ; but of documentary evidence, letters, or unmistakable proof, we must say that we have found nothing. In his analysis of the popularity of the doctrines, Mgr. Ricard is much happier. In some very pleasant chapters the author is successful in tracing the arts by which the chief men of the movement succeeded in gaining over high-born ladies, the leaders of fashion, to their cause. Jansenism became *de rigueur* in the *salons* and *hôtels* where " *Les Mères de l'Eglise*," as they were pleasantly termed, held their *réunions*. The following bit is charming : " Un jour l'une d'elles présidait, dans son hôtel, une réunion d'évêques. Des gens d'affaires demandèrent à la voir pour une solution pressante ; on leur répondit : Madame ne peut vous parler, *elle travaille aux affaires de l'Eglise*" (p. 107).

Readers will not fail to turn with mournful interest to the careful and appreciative study of the great Pascal, at page 325 and onwards. It is one of the gravest charges against Jansenism that it quenched this magnificent genius in its gloom and fanatical resistance to the Holy See. On the whole, we have seldom met with a difficult and intricate subject treated in so charming and fascinating a style. There is a good deal of startling period, of flashing phrase, of suspended narrative, but there is real solid literary work under these little sallies of fancy of our less phlegmatic neighbour.

---

1. *A System of Christian Doctrine.* By Dr. J. A. DORNER. Translated by Rev. ALFRED CAVE, B.A., and Rev. J. S. BANKS. Four vols. 8vo. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 1880-2.
2. *A History of Christian Doctrines.* By the late Dr. K. R. HAGEN-BACH. Three vols. 8vo. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 1881-2.

WE wish that we could speak more favourably of Dr. Dorner's *History* ; and if we venture to express our belief that the labour spent on the translation of his ponderous work is, for the most part, labour lost, we can only say that we began to read his book with a prepossession in its favour. Dr. Dorner is prominent in a school which endeavours to reconcile the best results of German

speculation and of critical research with an honest acceptance of Christian doctrine; and it is quite plain that the great doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, of the judgment to come and of the life beyond the grave, are realities to him, no less than to us. There is everything, therefore, in his position to call forth sympathy from those who, however they may differ from him on other points, agree with him in maintaining these cardinal truths. Besides, Dr. Dorner has a high reputation for wide and accurate learning; nor do we for a moment doubt that his fame is well earned. It is natural to suppose that a veteran scholar will always be able to give valuable information on the history of doctrine. Men of very different opinions have, *e.g.*, done much to illustrate the doctrine of the Trinity in its ecclesiastical development. Petavius and Cardinal Newman have treated the subject with exhaustive learning, and the latter, in particular, has shown such a mastery of patristic literature, such a power of distinguishing between the stages in the development of the doctrine, between the way in which it presented itself to different authors and churches, such precision of thought, such marvellous lucidity of exposition, that the impression once made on a careful student can scarcely be effaced. Even when details are forgotten, the main features in the history remain. Nor have we any wish to deny the merits of writers outside the Church. Bull (little as we are able to follow him in his main contention) is a clear, as well as a learned writer, from whom much is to be learned. Nay, Baur, who can scarcely be called Christian, is not only a learned man, but a master of clear arrangement and clear expression. His statements, of course, need to be carefully sifted, for he is always apt to exaggerate doctrinal differences, and to force history into the schemes of his own contriving. Still, we must frankly acknowledge our belief that no competent scholar will fail to learn much from his history of the Church in the first three centuries and his various works on the history of doctrine. As for the interest which he excites, that never flags, and it needs a sober judgment to correct the dangerous fascination of his views.

All these qualifications, learning alone excepted, are, so far as we can see, wanting in Dr. Dorner, and even his learning is singularly barren. He writes in a cumbrous style, and he is the slave of a philosophical pedantry which throws an obscurity over everything. Baur, too, is philosophical, but he is master of his philosophy, while Dorner is mastered by it. A single instance will serve to explain, and, as we think, to justify our criticism. Let us take the history of Sabellianism as given in the first volume. This heresy took two very different forms. It is rather difficult to say at what precise date, and in what manner, the one phase succeeded the other, but each phase of the doctrine is quite intelligible, and may easily be put in plain English or plain German. The older doctrine taught that the Father of all who is the One God, to the exclusion of all other persons, and therefore not Father in the Trinitarian sense, was born of a virgin, suffered and died. This was the teaching which

Praxeas brought to Rome under Eleutherus (175–189), it was the doctrine of Noetus, excommunicated at Smyrna about 230, and of his disciples Epigonos and Cleomenes, who went to Rome. For all this we have very early and sufficient evidence—viz., Tertull. *adv. Prax.*, especially 1, 28, 29–30; the work of Hippolytus against Noetus, recently edited by Lagarde and the *Philosophumena*, ix. 7–10. Apparently, though the fact has been disputed by scholars of name, this was the original tenet of Sabellius himself. For so much as this is expressly asserted concerning him by Dionysius of Rome (apud Athanas. *De Decret. Syn. Nic.* and edited by Routh, *Rell. Sacr.*, tom. iii. p. 373, *seq.*), and by Novatian (*De Trin. 12*), not to speak of later authorities, such as Athanasius (*Orat. iii. 36*), and many others quoted by Cardinal Newman in the *Oxford Athanasius* (p. 529).

It was hard to bring this older doctrine even into apparent conformity with the Church's confession of Three Persons—*e.g.*, in the Baptismal form. The Father, they said, becoming man was called Son: but what of the Holy Ghost? An early writer, Dionysius of Alexandria (apud Euseb. *H. E. vii. 6*) reproaches the Sabellians with this very thing—viz., that they had “no idea of the Holy Spirit” (*ἀναρθησίαν τοῦ δύον πνεύματος*). Hence, Sabellius, or at least the Sabellians, came to hold that the same Person is the Holy Ghost, so far as He manifests Himself in the Christian Church, and, by parity of reasoning, Son, so far as He appeared in Christ. In this way all belief in a real Trinity was destroyed, and instead nothing left except “one Person with three names” (*ἐν τριώνυμον πρόσωπον*. Theodor. *Haer. Fab. ii. 9*; Epiphan. *Haer. lxii. 1*), and the reality of the Incarnation was set aside likewise. In all probability the doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra was little else than a reproduction of Sabellianism in its latter phase. (See *e.g.* Euseb. *adv. Marcell. ii. 2–4*, *Eccles. Theol. iii. 8–17*.)

Now our quarrel with Dr. Dorner is, first, that he wraps up two doctrines, which are perfectly simple, in the terms of German philosophy till they become almost unintelligible. We think that we have deciphered his meaning, but only because we were already familiar with the early accounts of the heresy. Surely an historian's business is to let early teachers express their own ideas in their own words or in the words of the age in which they lived, and to add necessary explanations. The philosophical phraseology of later times, whether it be borrowed from mediæval schoolmen or Germans of our own century, is completely out of place, and simply distracting. It is among the great merits of Petavius that he saw the anachronism which such a method involves, and refused to adjust the Fathers to scholastic formulæ. Next, Dorner never hints that there is any dispute among critics as to the teaching of Sabellius himself, while he accuses St. Ignatius of Patripassian doctrine, which is indeed an old charge, without offering any proof whatever beyond a vague reference to his “Epistles.” Lastly, whereas it is the duty of the historian to refer the student to the sources, and

to assist him in understanding their sense and estimating their value, Dorner does not in this section give one definite reference to Patristic literature. Instead, we are sent to consult various German works—*e.g.*, Zahn on Marcellus. Zahn is a learned man and deserves to be read with attention, but he is no proper substitute for original authorities. And this manner of referring to German authorities, wrong anywhere, is doubly wrong now that the book is presented to English readers—few of whom are likely to have the German monographs at their command.

Hagenbach is at least intelligible, and on the principle that error is preferable to confusion, it is a relief to turn from Dr. Dorner to him. Nor do we doubt that some information may be gained from his work by those who are already more or less familiar with the subject. But for the purpose which the author intended—viz., to supply a handbook for students—we can scarcely imagine anything worse. *Erroribus scatet*—it literally swarms with errors. We select a few at random from the first few pages of the third volume. There we are told that the Council of Trent sat from 1545 to 1593. Maldonatus is said to have opposed the Jesuit view of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin as necessary to the faith. It is scarcely necessary to say, that the dispute of Maldonatus was with the University of Paris; and the learned author of this manual does not appear to have known that Maldonatus was himself a Jesuit, or that he wrote famous commentaries on the Gospel. He is equally ignorant that the doctrines of the Spanish mystic Molinos were grossly and openly immoral: \* if so, in spite of his own fanaticism against the Jesuits, he would not have ventured to contrast the spirituality of Molinos with the worldliness of the disciples of St. Ignatius of Loyola. He says that the history of Natalis Alexander was edited by Romaglia, meaning, we suppose, Roncaglia; and he mentions this historian, not for his merits, which are great, but because he was condemned at Rome. Tillemont, Fleury, &c., did not secure this honour, and therefore are passed over. In an account of Bossuet's relations to Protestants, not a word is said of his famous controversies with Claude and Jurieu (the latter is mentioned elsewhere, and his name spelt Jurien), though we are told that “he was opposed by Basnage—Hist. de la Rel. des Églises Réformées, Rot. 1721; and Pfaff, Disputatt. Anti-Bossuet, Sub. 1720”—to which “Bossuet replied by his Défence, &c., Paris, 1701.” A strange feat in any case, if the dates are right; and stranger still, considering that Bossuet died in 1704. We may take the section on the “double procession” of the Holy Ghost as a sample of the treatment of doctrine in the patristic and mediæval periods. It is almost incredible, but true nevertheless, that the formula generally adopted in the East—viz., “from the Father through the

\* Any one who has the least doubt on the point may be referred to the documents printed recently by Laemmer in his “Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa,” viz., “Breve Relatione dell' abjura del Dottor Molinos e suoi seguaci,” and “Condanno del S. Officio di Roma contro Pietro Pegna Segretario di Molinos.”

Son"—is not so much as named. The first Latin Father quoted for the double procession is Augustine, while the earlier statement of Hilary (De Trin. iii. 29) is not mentioned (see also Tertul. adv. Prax. 4). "Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and others," are stated to have "asserted the procession of the Spirit from the Father without distinctly denying (*sic*) that He also proceeds from the Son." As a matter of fact, each of these Fathers distinctly implies that the Holy Ghost does proceed from the Son (see Athanas. Orat. iii. 24, p. 454; ed. Benedict. ad Serap. iii. 1, p. 552; Basil. Contr. Eunom. v. *ib.* ii. 34, p. 271; Greg. Nyss. Quod non sint tres dii—Opp. tom. i. p. 459). Nor should we ever guess from Dr. Hagenbach's account that the first express denial by an Eastern Father of the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son occurs in S. John of Damascus (Fid. Orthod. i. 8); still less should we discover that the true sense of the Saint's words has led to a dispute, in which great critics are ranged on different sides. The great authority on the whole history of the question is Le Quien, in a dissertation prefixed to his great edition of S. John of Damascus. Le Quien is the great, we may almost say the sole, authority on the question, for his treatise exhausts the subject in all its ramifications; but he is not even named among the authorities to which Hagenbach refers his readers.

We are sorry to adopt a line which is meant to be severe, and which may seem presumptuous. But there is a foolish and uncritical admiration of German "learning," just as there is a habit, even more foolish and uncritical, of depreciating German scholarship as a whole. We cannot but believe that Dean Plumptre was a little under the influence of the former spirit when he wrote his laudatory preface to the translation of Hagenbach.

W. E. ADDIS.

---

1. *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the three so-called Poetical Books of the Old Testament.* By WILLIAM WICKES, D.D. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1881.
2. *Winer's Chaldäische Grammatik für Bibel und Targumim.* Dritte Auflage, vermehrt durch eine Anleitung zum Studium des Midrasch und Talmud von Dr. BERNARD FISCHER. Leipzig: J. A. Barth. 1882. (*Winer's Chaldee Grammar for the Bible and the Targums.* Third edition, with the addition of an Introduction to the Study of the Midrash and Talmud by Dr. BERNARD FISCHER.)

DR. WICKES cannot hope for more than a very limited circle of readers, but they will not fail to give him the gratitude which is his due for the learning and self-denying labour which he has embodied in his little treatise. The Hebrew accents, as all who have learned even a little Hebrew know, form one of the most complicated and difficult departments of Hebrew scholarship. The very word "accent" is misleading, for the signs which go by that name

are at once notes for the chanting or musical recitation in the synagogue, stops or pauses which distinguish the sense in the most minute and elaborate manner, and accents in the proper sense, determining the syllable on which the stress of the voice is to fall. There are two systems of accentuation, one adopted in the three so-called poetical books—*i.e.*, in Job, except the prologue and epilogue, Proverbs, and Psalms; the other throughout the rest of the Bible. There are no less than twenty-seven accents for the prose, and twenty for the poetical books. The Jews themselves admit that the musical value of the accents is now altogether unknown, but these accents retain their significance as a system of interpunctuation, and so represent a very old tradition on the exact meaning of the text. A good deal has been done recently to throw light on the matter. Dr. Davidson, of the New College at Edinburgh, has given us a useful treatise on the prose accents, and Baer has written two treatises on the poetical ones, besides editing the three poetical books with the special object of securing correctness in the accents. The grammars are of little use here. There is nothing, or scarcely anything, in Gesenius, only a few lines on the poetical accents in Kalisch, while Ewald's discussion of the subject, though full, is very obscure, and abounds in doubtful speculation. We were glad therefore when Professor Driver, some time ago, announced a forthcoming treatise on the poetical accents from the very competent hand of Dr. Wickes. Few are entitled to judge a certain portion of his labour, for, to ensure correctness of text, he has visited the leading libraries of Europe and collated the most important Hebrew MSS.; nor has he neglected the older printed copies, which are often free from the errors of Van der Hooght. But this much we are free to say of Dr. Wickes, he has explained the laws of the poetical accents in a manner which leaves nothing to be desired for clearness of language, systematic arrangement, and compression of style. Not a word is wasted, and not a word is wanting, and the treatise proper does not exceed about ninety pages small octavo. We believe that anyone who takes the trouble to master it will be almost fascinated by the orderly arrangement, and by the pleasure of seeing light break in on the previous darkness.

Winer's Chaldee Grammar is a classical book, and needs no commendation. It is still the best book of its kind, though Petermann's Grammar is useful for the full account it gives of the literature of the language. Turpie's Chaldee Grammar, lately published in London, has only one merit—viz., the excellence of its paper and type; otherwise it is merely an imperfect and very inaccurate reproduction of Winer. The new editor of Winer is a German Rabbi, well-known for his edition of Buxtorf's Chaldee and Ruthenical Lexicon. He has done little for Winer. The account of the literature is not brought up to date, and the new Introduction on the History of the Aramaic Dialects is especially disappointing. The deciphering of the cuneiform inscriptions has cast a flood of light on the languages of Mesopotamia; and an exact account of the

geographical limits which separated the Syriac from the Chaldee language is still a desideratum. But no one will gain any real information on these points from Dr. Fischer's introduction. It is occupied mostly with fanciful hypothesis and irrelevant matter. Still it is a gain, no doubt, to have a new edition of Winer's valuable book, which was out of print; and it is good for the eyes to exchange the blotting paper and ugly type of the old book for the new edition, which is at least respectable in the appearance it presents.

W. E. ADDIS.

---

*Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social.* By Sir ALFRED C. LYALL, K.C.B., C.I.E. London: John Murray. 1882.

THIS volume contains eleven essays, written by Sir Alfred Lyall, during the last ten years, in such intervals of leisure as his official duties in India allowed him. Ten of them relate to that country, and are, as he says, the outcome of personal observation and of intercourse with the people. The other treats of the relations between the State and Religion in the Chinese Empire, with which the author has no direct acquaintance. All these papers, he thinks, and his modest claim must be fully admitted, may be considered to have some useful bearing on the general study of Asiatic ideas and institutions. "Throughout Asia," he observes—

wherever the state of society has not been distinctly transformed by European influences, there is a fundamental resemblance in the social condition of the people, in their intellectual level, and in their habits of thought. And although India is, in many respects, a peculiar country, isolated and fenced off from the rest of the continent by broad belts of high and often impassable mountain country, so that it cannot be classed either with Eastern or Western Asia, yet it possesses, by reason of its extraordinary variety of peoples, creeds, and manners, a strong affinity with the widely different countries on either side of it; it partakes largely of the religious characteristics both of Western Asia, whence it has received Mahomedanism, and of Eastern Asia, to which it has given Buddhism, the pure outcome of Hindu theosophy; and it has preserved specimens of almost every stage in the history of Asiatic politics, and the growth of Asiatic societies. No single first class country of Asia, therefore, so well repays examination; and it is just this part of Asia in which Europeans have had incomparably the best opportunities of accurate and continuous observation.—Preface, p. v.

The great merit of Sir Alfred Lyall's book is indicated in the last words we have quoted from him. With the single exception of the sixth essay—which has a peculiar value of its own—every page of it reflects that accurate and continuous observation for which many years spent in Hindostan have given him such abundant facilities. In the first chapter, entitled "Religion of an Indian Province," he endeavours to illustrate the actual religious condition of India by the example of the region with which he is peculiarly well acquainted—the province of Berar, situated nearly in the centre of the Empire, and containing among its two millions and odd

inhabitants, 155,000 Mahomedans and adherents of most forms of what is vaguely called Hinduism. In the second chapter he examines Mr. Grote's well-known theory about the nature of myths, that they are a special product of the imagination and feeling, radically distinct both from history and philosophy, and contends, upon the strength of "an extensive observation of the mythopoetic faculty in India—perhaps the only ancient country which still keeps alive a true polytheism of the first order—that this purely sceptical attitude ignores a great deal of collateral evidence in favour of the position that myths are ordinarily formed round a nucleus of facts, any other formation being exceptional." Without embracing the theory of Euemerus as "a key to all mythologies," he would say that, "in constructing the science of religion, we might do worse than make room for it," and he remarks, justly enough, upon the intolerance of theorists, who, as a rule, "are not satisfied until they have hunted every rival theory clear off the ground." As a matter of fact, he assures us, "a large number of veritable men are now worshipped as gods in various parts of India, and the number is constantly added to," and in another place he says, "indeed there is a such a crush and jumble of new gods constantly pushing themselves forward up the Jacob's ladder in India, that without fresh blood no old-established deity could long maintain predominance." "Fresh blood," he adds, "may be obtained by the simple expedient of a new embodiment of the old fashioned divinity, if the competitor is a new and remarkable personage, or by "a new attribute if it is a physical discovery." Let us quote yet another very striking passage from this same essay, abbreviating it a little :—

For the purposes of the science of religion, and as a study of further developments, it is worth while observing how the spiritualists of India, the preachers of pure morals and of subjective creeds, are hampered and entangled by this gross materialism of the people. No spiritual teacher of mark can evade being reckoned a god (or a visible embodiment of divine power) by the outer-ring of his disciples, and an atheist or blasphemer by his enemies ; he may disown and denounce, but the surrounding atmosphere is too strong for him. . . . To the mass of Hindus it is quite simple that they shall indulge their fancy in following after any new deity or saint who is likely to do them a good turn, without troubling themselves whether this latest dispensation is in accordance or collision with their every-day ritual. So they insist on recognizing the spiritualist as a fresh manifestation of Power, and they worship him accordingly. This does not much offend orthodoxy, which has no great objection to adding to the number of deities ; but the esoteric doctrines, which probably drown all priesthoods and gods together in the depth of some mystic revelation, are much more likely to get their authors into trouble. Hence arise the secret fraternities, the symbols and masonic signs, by which nearly every spiritual sect intercommunicates. These things are used to save the teacher from his friends as well as from his enemies ; the melancholy ascetic may be seen sitting and enduring the adoration of the crowd ; he does not encourage them, but he does not much attempt to undeceive them. His secret, his way of life, his glimpse behind the curtain before which all this illusive stage-play of the visible world goes on, his short cut out of the circle of miserable existences, these things he

imparts to those disciples whom he selects out of the herd, and whom he sends abroad to distribute the news. When he dies he is canonized, and he may fall into the grip of the Brahmins after all, and be turned into an embodiment of a god, but his society may also survive and spread on its spiritual basis. Unluckily, secret societies, founded on the purest principles are unsafe institutions in all ages. They are, of course, regarded suspiciously by every Government, and with very good reason; for their movements in Asia are sure to grow into political agitation whenever they acquire any impetus. And in India there is such a perceptible tendency of spiritual liberalism to degenerate into licence—there is so much evidence of the liability of the purest mysticism to be interpreted by way of orgies among weaker brethren—that one may guess scandalous stories about private gatherings of the initiated to have been not altogether without foundation in any age or country.

Whether a spiritual ascetic shall succeed in founding a sect with inner lights or only a fresh group of votaries which adore him as a peculiar manifestation of divinity, seems to depend much upon all kinds of chance. Sometimes both conceptions of him survive, and thus we get that duplex formation so common in Eastern religions—the esoteric doctrine and the exoteric cult (p. 47).

This second chapter “On the Origin of Divine Myths in India” is perhaps from one point of view—and that a point of view particularly interesting to us—the most important in the work. Hence we have been tempted to linger upon it. To students of another class of problems, the seventh and eighth chapters, “On the Formation of Class and Caste,” and “On the Rajput States in India”—chapters which Sir Henry Maine has largely used in a portion of his recently published “Early Law”—will be of quite peculiar value. We cannot now do more than thus mention them. For we wish to devote the remaining small space at our command to the very striking third chapter, upon “the Influence of Religion of Vice and Morality.” We will give two extracts from it. Remarking on the difficulty presented to primeval thinkers by the observed fact that the gods appear to be often upon the side of the wicked, or, at least, against the innocent, he continues:—

Here comes in the complication between sin and evil which runs through all phases of religious speculation, from Buddha to J. S. Mill, the problem of justifying the ways of the unseen powers which are assumed to be governing human affairs. The earliest and most simple attempts to account for evil are by assuming that the gods must have in some most mysterious way been offended; whence comes the institution of the scapegoat so well known in India in plagues of cholera, which embodies that idea of expiation which has had such immense development in the history of religions; and the various receipts for discovering Jonah, the man with a contagious curse, not necessarily a moral offender, but only one who has incurred the divine wrath, who is also common throughout all Asia. Next follows the advanced notion that this offence against the gods is not only some insult or sacrilege, as when Ulysses killed the sacred oxen, but is a moral sin, an offence against society of which the gods take magisterial cognizance. Job’s comforters try hard to prove to him that he must be reaping the fruit of his own guilt, and in all times the early theologian has made desperate endeavours to connect misfortune with misconduct, though often driven to explain the connection by refer-

ences to ancestral stain, or to the hypothesis of something done in a previous existence. But the more vigorous and daring minds rejected these subterfuges; and finding themselves landed in the dilemma between the omnipotence and the perfect justice of divinity, they solved it in different ways. Buddha held firmly to morality, threw over the gods altogether as immoral and troublesome powers from which a philosopher has to escape as fast as he can, and objected even to heaven as a final resting-place, on the ground that you are never safe so long as you own a sentient existence. Nothing but *Nirvâna*, or being blown out like a lamp, will set men finally beyond the reach of the demon who afflicts them with sensation. This teaching was, however, a moral and metaphysical doctrine vastly above the heads of the people; and practical common-sense Hinduism has never allowed questions as to the moral character of the gods to be sufficient reason for turning one's back on them or refusing to deal with them. Philosophers may have concluded privately that the gods are either incompetent or ill-disposed, a class of beings who must be endured and ignored; but the people have always made the best of their divinities so long as they did not oppose themselves to reasonable improvements in the moral standard, adapted themselves to circumstances, and recognized governments *de facto*. Mere peccadillos attributed to one or two out of many gods are of little account. Arthur Young ridicules a Frenchman who denounced to him the profligacy of Louis XV; and he says that Frederick the Great was a much more objectionable despot, because it is infinitely less important to the commonwealth, that a king should take a fancy to his neighbour's wife than that he should fancy his neighbour's provinces. This view, though questionable, is precisely that taken by polytheists of their divinities, so long as the gods do not bring more tremendous misfortune upon the country they need not be particularly moral; their speciality not being the direction of morals, as in later faiths, but the distribution of temporal blessings and curses (p. 62).

The concluding portion of this chapter, in which Sir Alfred Lyall addresses himself to a very practical question, is so remarkable and suggestive that we must cite it:—

But in India the peculiarity of the situation is that very primitive religious beliefs are being unexpectedly overtaken by an unusually high tide of public morals and spreading knowledge, which have come upon them without due warning; and the nature gods are confronted by penal codes and modern education in a sudden way that is hardly fair. They have no time to reform, hardly time to change their costume; it is even questionable whether they will easily manœuvre their retreat out of the material into the spiritual world, give up the distribution of material blessings, and fall back upon future states of existence over which their power cannot be tested. It has already been noticed as a characteristic of the phase of religious beliefs hitherto prevailing, that the doctrine of heaven and hell, though well known and accepted in Hinduism, has not exercised any great influence over the people. The ordinary worshipper looks for material blessing or ban; the philosopher accepts heaven and hell not as departments of reward or punishment, but as places of purification whereby a soul may be cleansed of its sensations, and become absorbed again into the Infinite, or escape into nothing. Both these conceptions arose out of a thorough distrust of the gods, the people dealing with them just as far as they could see (or thought they could see) that worship was answered by works, the philosopher renouncing them and all their works as completely as he dared. Nevertheless, if these beliefs are

prematurely submerged, we may have an awkward break in the continuity of theologic development, and it is not quite clear how this may affect morals. We may after all find morality in India, as elsewhere, looking dubiously at the ladder she has kicked down, and seriously alarmed at the decline of religious beliefs which has been the necessary consequence of her own rise. Or it may be that those are right who insist that Asia has always been too deep a quicksand for Europe to build upon it any lasting edifice of morals, politics, or religion; that the material conditions forbid any lasting improvement; that the English legions, like the Roman, will tramp across the Asiatic stage and disappear, and that the clouds of confusion and superstition will roll up again. Then, after all, the only abiding and immovable figure in the midst of the phantasmagoria will be that of the Hindu ascetic and sceptic, looking on at the incessant transformation of men into gods, and gods into men, with thoughts that have been caught by an English poet, and expressed in lines that have a strange Asiatic note—

All ye as a wind shall go by, so a fire shall ye pass and be past;  
Ye are gods, and behold, ye shall die—and the waves be upon you at last.  
In the darkness of time, in the deeps of the years, in the changes of  
things,  
Ye shall sleep as a slain man sleeps, and the world shall forget you  
as kings" (p. 73).

So much must suffice by way of specimen of this very thoughtful volume. It will be sufficient to show among other things how far removed the author's point of view is from ours. But that makes his book of especial value to us. As a rule, it is precisely from those who differ from us most that we learn most.

---

*Udānavarga. A Collection of Verses from the Buddhist Canon. Compiled by DHARMATRĀTA. Translated from the Thibetan of the Bkah-hgyur, with Notes and Extracts from the Commentary of Pradjñāvarman. By W. WOODVILLE ROCKHILL. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) London : Trübner. 1883.*

THE "Udānavarga" is a Northern Buddhist version of the "Dhammapada," which, as every one knows, we suppose, is one of the most famous of the Buddhist sacred books, and which has been translated into English from the Chinese by Mr. Beal, and from the Pāli version by Professor Max Müller. Dharmatrāta, the compiler of the "Udānavarga," lived, as Mr. Rockhill establishes by conclusive arguments (see page 11 of his Introduction), between 75 B.C. and 200 A.D. He probably wrote in Sanscrit. The Thibetan translation, from which Mr. Rockhill's version has been made, was executed by Vidyaprabhākara, who may probably be assigned to the ninth century of our era. Certainly the commentator Pradjñāvarman lived in that century, and the following account of him, given in the Thibetan introduction to the "Udānavarga Vivarana," is worth quoting :—

Pradjñāvarman was an Indian of Bhongala (Bhangala ?), and a disciple of Bodhivarman, of Kapadhyara (sic). He was born at Kava, in the country of Bhangala, and his fame was great; he was blessed with great

steadfastness and sound understanding. Being blessed with the recollection of many of the flawless jewels uttered in the Dharma, he was of infinite service to the rest of mankind. His recollection of the many sayings of the holy law caused him to shine forth like the sun, and through the extent of his knowledge he dispelled the darkness that enveloped mankind, bringing them joy and confidence. . . . He composed, then, a commentary to help to set forth clearly the sayings which he used to speak to the multitudes. He kept the still beautiful cut flowers (of the Dharma) in their original form, but dispelled the obscurity of some of the utterances, making their perfections to burst forth like lotus flowers, and thus every one of the utterances of the most excellent of Munis (*i.e.*, Gautama) has become as bright as the sun. This commentary was therefore composed to extract the essence of the utterances of the Tathâgata, called "words of great blessing," or "udânas"—fragments of the words of the Victorious One—and to teach their real signification (Introduction, p. xii.).

So much as to the author of the commentary which Mr. Rockhill has made use of in the volume before us. We must express our regret that he has not made more use of it, and especially that he has given but a few of the short stories ("nidânas" they are called), which Prâdjñâvarman prefixes to most verses—stories that are by way of explaining the circumstances which called forth each particular utterances of the Buddha. Mr. Rockhill thinks that in "the great majority of cases these stories have evidently been invented to suit the text," which appears to us to be saying too much. But however that may be, they are certainly, to say the least, of considerable value as illustrating the condition of the Buddhist mind at the period when the commentator wrote, and Mr. Rockhill's valuable book would, in our judgment, have been more valuable still if he had given us all of them.

---

*Dissertations on Early Law and Custom*: chiefly selected from Lectures delivered at Oxford. By Sir HENRY SUMNER MAINE. London: J. Murray. 1883.

IT is related that a painstaking student of English literature once read the two folio volumes of Johnson's Dictionary through, and on being asked what he thought of the work, replied that it was most interesting though slightly disconnected. We might say the same of this new book of Sir Henry Maine's. Every paper in it is of extreme value, and that not only for what it actually teaches, but also—and still more—for what it suggests. But a reprint of studies ranging over such a great variety of topics as are indicated by their titles—the Sacred Laws of the Hindus, Religion and Law, Ancestor Worship, Ancestor Worship and Inheritance, Royal Succession and the Salic Law, the King in Relation to Early Civil Justice, Theories of Primitive Society, East European House Communities, Decay of Feudal Property in France and England, Classifications of Property, Classifications of Legal Rules—somewhat distracts the mind by its diversity. The subject, however, which receives most ample treatment is one which has for many years been recognized as the author's special and

peculiar province—the development of primitive society. Of late, many facts have been brought to light, which, to say the least, are hard to reconcile with some of the positions maintained by him. And the portion of this volume which will be most interesting to the student of scientific archæology is that in which Sir Henry Maine examines the objections against the patriarchal theory of society, powerfully urged by several recent writers of much ability, especially by the late Mr. McLennan. We can here do little more than remark upon the extreme candour with which Sir Henry Maine discusses "these new facts and theories," and considers their bearing upon the opinions advanced by himself in his well-known work on *Ancient Law*. The thesis there maintained by him was, as many of our readers will remember, that "the theory of the origin of society in separate families, held together by the authority and protection of the eldest valid male descendant, has claims to be considered 'a real historical theory,' while the theories based upon the hypothesis of a law and state of Nature, which have been so widely received among men, and have exercised such great influence upon the world's history have no such claim at all." And now, after examining the testimony alleged against it, in what are perhaps the most luminous and suggestive pages of the present volume, the author, while, with his usual caution, recording his doubt whether "the investigation has advanced far enough to admit of a very confident opinion," tells us, "If the inquiry were to be confined to the ancient institution of the group of societies which I examined more than twenty years ago, I should still maintain the conclusions which I reached, subject only to some qualifications which are suggested in the first four chapters of the present work (p. 95).

Perhaps the essay in this volume of most general interest is the one upon "The Decay of Feudal Property in France and England." The land system in the two countries, as every well-informed student is aware, was originally the same.

All feudal society (as Sir Henry Maine observes), is a reproduction of a single typical form. This *unit* consists of a group of men settled on a definite space of land, and forming what we Englishmen call a *Manor*, and what in France was called a *Fief*. The *Manor*, or *Fief*, in its origin, was as much a political as a proprietary body, as nearly akin to a *State* as to an *Estate*. It retained, even in its decay, some of the characteristic and curiously persistent marks of Aryan political organisms. The lord is the *Baσιλεύς*, the *rex*, the *king*. The free tenants are the *γεροντία*, the *senate*, the *council*. The villeins are the mass of the people; and below them are the true bondmen, the slaves, or thralls, or, in later legal language, the villeins *in gross*. The *Signorial Court*, the *Court Baron*, is the ancient village assembly, in which the administration of justice has now taken precedence of other public concerns, but in which those public concerns continue to be discussed, the lord presiding, the free tenants advising, the villeins attending without definite share or voice in the deliberations, like the crowd in the Homeric *Agora*. Those fines, dues, and monopolies which still annoy the English copyholder of our day, which went far to cause the first French Revolution, and which had to be cleared away by a timely stroke of statesmanship before Prussia could begin a struggle to

relieve herself from French military despotism, were in their origin rather in the nature of taxes than in the nature of rent. They represent the ancient provision for the service of the little village commonwealth. Some of them may have sprung from the oppressions of the lord, and some from agreement with him; but the greatest part had their origin in regulated force, the sovereignty of the little State. . . . To the typical form which I have described, Kingdoms were adjusted no less than Manors. The sovereign who became the most powerful in Europe, the King of France, was the lord of an exalted Manor. His free tenants were the Dukes of Normandy and Burgundy, the Counts of Toulouse and Champagne; his domain consisted of Paris and of the old Duchy of France. These continental institutions were reproduced in England, but, as has often been the case, *with a difference*. The great power of the early Anglo-Norman kings came from their allowing nobody to be absolutely interposed, like a Duke of Burgundy, between themselves and their subjects, and from their exacting fealty, and therefore military service from all Englishmen (Freeman, "Norman Conquest," iv. 694). We can trace the Manorial group backwards to an earlier social form, a body of men democratically, or rather aristocratically, governed, in which the free tenants had as yet no lord, the village community. We can also trace its gradual dissolution, until the forms of landed property were established, with which we are all familiar. The exact point before us is, why did the Manor, in its decay, produce such different results in England and France? Why did its transformation end in one country in a revolution, which is an epoch of history? Why, in another, in a somewhat inconvenient form of landed property? (p. 302.)

It is a most interesting question, and a question of great practical importance if there is any truth—and assuredly there is—in the ancient saw that "history is philosophy teaching by experience." For Sir Henry Maine's answer we must refer our readers to his own pages. Here we can only briefly indicate its outlines. One powerful cause of the difference, as he points out, lies in the strong distinction between the judicial organization of France and England. A hundred years ago the French Seignorial Court was a flourishing institution, and a very oppressive one, while the English Manorial Court was a mere shadow. Then again, in England, the titles of the Lord of the Manor and of the copyholder are, and are known to be, to a very large extent, rooted in contract. In France, a hundred years ago, manorial rights were popularly believed to "have originated in simple violence," to have sprung from "the ancient helplessness of the villein." Once more: France was then, as now, to a large extent, a country of peasant proprietors. "The sense of property in land was not in the seigneur, but in the peasant." And the mass of petty landholders were exasperated by the feudal dues which they had to pay, and by the monopolies which curtailed their property. These are causes which Sir Henry Maine thinks "have been kept too much in the background." Of others "which are intermingled with the whole structure of French society," and which "it belongs to the civil historian to bring to light," he writes as follows:—

De Tocqueville has strongly suggested, and others after him will probably demonstrate, that the enormous social prestige of the French Court and its constant indulgence of its military tastes had at length turned

the French territorial nobility into a caste as distinct from the cultivating peasantry as is the Rajput from the Sudra, as distinct as was the white planter of the Southern States from the negro who laboured in his cane-fields. The effect of this deep alienation was completely to alter the normal or natural character of the social group of which I have spoken, the Manor or Fief. Left to itself, it is one of the most conservative of all institutions. In our own country the Manor is in extreme decay, and chiefly survives in its ecclesiastical organization as the Parish. In France a revolution has passed over the Fief, and it has become a mere administrative subdivision, the Commune. . . . In the latter half of the eighteenth century the normal operation of the Fief was reversed in France. Many causes, and among them that personal friction which is the despair of all who would make history a science, had produced among the peasantry such intensity of hatred to their lord that they were ready to find allies against him anywhere—before the Revolution, in the despotic King and his usurping agents—after the Revolution, in the Convention, in the Jacobin Club, in the Directory, in the First Consul, who was soon to be the Emperor. And even now the tradition of the feudal dues and the fear of their revival are political influences of the first order, tending to make a great part of the nation ready, or not reluctant, to throw itself (as a great French orator said) into the arms of the first lucky corporal who makes it believe that he can preserve the institutions created at the Revolution, without bringing back the Revolution itself (p. 328).

---

*The Solution of the Pyramid Problem.* By R. BALLARD, C.E.  
New York: J. Wiley & Sons. 1882.

A NOTHER solution of the riddle propounded by the Egyptian Sphinx! Professor Piazzi Smyth finds in the pyramids a perfect encyclopaedia of Biblical, astronomical, and scientific lore. Mr. Proctor sees in their wonderful adaptability to astronomical purposes a grand apparatus for astrological work. Mr. Ballard propounds a more prosaic, but certainly a more reasonable, view, that the pyramids were grand plumb-lines for accurate survey of the Delta. In a country, where the soil is so fertile and so cultivated, the accurate determination of boundary marks must be of the last importance. But the constant deposition of Nile mud, and the flooding of the low-lying lands, must have the effect of constantly obliterating the boundaries. Now the clean-cut pyramids, with their edges standing out sharp against the clear blue southern skies, would make admirable theodolites with the exercise of a little ingenuity. A circumstance in favour of the author's theory is, that it is the only one that can offer a reasonable explanation why Mycerinus was cased in red granite. For details of how the three pyramids could be actually employed in surveying, we must refer to our author's pages. We fear, however, that his exaltation at the supposed discovery of the royal Babylonian cubit is a little premature. He must know by this time that the measures of the base of the Great Pyramid, on which his calculations are founded, are shown by Mr. Petrie's recent excavations to be erroneous.

*Miss Austen's Novels.* In Six Volumes. The Steventon Edition.  
London: Bentley & Son. 1882.

THAT within a period of twelve months a publisher should be enabled to offer to the public two editions of such an author as Miss Austen, is a fact which speaks favourably for the good taste of the public, and significantly for the enterprise of the publishers. In 1881 Messrs. Bentley and Son published at a reasonable cost, and in a handy form, a popular edition of the whole of Miss Austen's novels. In 1882 the same firm were bold enough to issue a new edition, for a totally different class of readers—an *edition de luxe*, handsomely printed on fine paper, in a clear type, and with chocolate coloured ink, bound in delicate white cloth, and illustrated with steel-engraved frontispieces. And it is satisfactory to learn, as indicative of the taste and appreciation of the age which also patronises the sensational school of novels, that the venture of Messrs. Bentley has been attended with a marked success. The costly edition has been almost exhausted, we believe, within the period of a single season, and but few copies were still on sale when inquiries were made shortly before the issue of the last number of the DUBLIN REVIEW.

This appreciation at the present day of Miss Austen's well-nigh, perhaps altogether, incomparable delineations of English life of her own era, is the more remarkable when we call to mind the well-known difficulties she encountered in the publication of her novels when they were first written. But a later generation than her own has set its seal upon the intrinsic merit and value of her lifelike sketches and finished pictures of a condition of society in England which has for ever passed away. Nor has the present generation the credit of being the first to realize the true excellence of these novels. For the past half-century there has been a continuous stream of editions issued from the press. These editions have been put forth with a variety of attractions, both of material and price, for the book-buying, novel-reading world. But, without knowing the reason, we believe that the house of Bentley has always had some special attraction to, or connection with, the Austen family, or with the works of Miss Austen. At all events, they alone have published the most trustworthy memoir of the great woman novelist of her day, and have had the honour, we believe, of re-introducing her novels to the reading world upwards of half a century ago. The same firm have issued editions of various forms and suited to different incomes, from one shilling in price upwards. And they have crowned their labour, of love and profit combined, by the publication and rapid sale of the "Steventon Edition." Between these efforts on the part of Bentley & Son to popularize Miss Austen, it may not be without interest to the reader to see the number and variety of editions which have issued from the press, a list of which may be found in the catalogue of the British Museum Library. They are as follows—premising that the

“Standard Novels,” containing Miss Austen’s, appeared in 1831; “Collection of British Authors,” 1841; “Parlour Novelist” and “Parlour Library” editions, both in 1847; other editions of Bentley, in 1849; editions of Routledge, from 1849 to 1851; “Railway Library” issue, in 1857; “Select Library of Fiction,” 1870; fresh Bentley edition, in 1871; “Ruby Series,” in 1877; and Bentley’s current edition, in 1881. The “Steventon Edition,” as has been said, was printed in 1882.

---

*The Theological and Philosophical Works of Hermes Trismegistus, Christian Neoplatonist.* Translated from the original Greek, with Preface, Notes, and Indices. By JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS, M.A., F.S.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1882.

WE are sorry to be obliged to confess that “thrice great Hermes,” as Milton called him, was an arrant impostor, who took advantage of the simplicity of some of the Christian Fathers. They mistook Hermes for a venerable Egyptian sage, anterior to Moses, who by the light of philosophy, conceived religious ideas considerably in advance of his age. And so they paid him the compliment of quoting sentences from him, and holding him up as a luminous example. It is now almost certain that the writer whom they thus honoured was some miserable Neoplatonist of the second or third century, who made a jumble of Platonism, heathenism, and Scripture. Thus “thrice great Hermes” has been made very small in these times, and indeed has fallen so low in reputation that we should hardly have thought it worth while to drag him forth from obscurity and give him an English dress. But Mr. Chambers has had the patience to do this, and has spared no pains to do it well. Still it must be confessed that despite of Mr. Chambers’s learned editing, Hermes Trismegistus cuts but a sorry figure. His English dress does not fit him, nor is his meaning less unintelligible. But it seems from the notes that Mr. Chambers is trying to make a Christian of Hermes and to pass off his Platonic babbling as the utterances of religious wisdom. It is here that we quarrel with Mr. Chambers. We deny that the author of “Poemandres” was in any sense a Christian, and we protest against his degrading sacred Scripture and Catholic theology by using them to illustrate the inanities of this maudlin sophist. One quotation will suffice to prove to our readers that Hermes was no Christian either before or after “the epoch of Monochism,” as Mr. Chambers absurdly calls it. Hermes says, p. 23, that it is the greatest irreligion for any one to die childless.

This man renders justice after death to the demon, and the punishment is this, that the soul of the childless should be condemned to a body having the nature neither of man nor of woman, which is accursed under the sun. Wherefore, O Asclepius! be mutually pleased with no one who is childless, but, on the contrary, pity the misfortune, knowing what punishment awaits him.

And Hermes calls this "a precognition somewhat of the nature of all things."

*Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* By F. GODET, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neufchatel. Translated from the French by the Rev. A. CUSIN, M.A. Two Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1881.

THE foreign theological library is certainly well supplied with commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans. Lange, Meyer, Tholuck, Olshausen, and Philippi have already been translated. But this has not prevented the enterprising publishers from adding M. Godet to their list. This of itself is no small proof of the repute in which the work is held. It is much to be regretted that all these works, and M. Godet's is no exception, are built on Lutheran or Calvinist lines. Protestant writers are so taken up with their favourite notion of forensic or external righteousness that they do their best to force their own meaning into St. Paul's text. Yet, as Sabatier has truly said, "St. Paul would not have had words enough to blast so gross an interpretation of his meaning." But abstracting from this most serious defect, we quite acknowledge that M. Godet's book has considerable merit, as the work of an earnest-minded and learned Professor. He styles the Apostle "A unique man for a unique work," and quotes Coleridge's remark that the Epistle to the Romans is the most profound work ever written. He rejects with indignation the description of St. Paul's outward appearance which M. Réan has put forward—"a man, little of stature, bald, short-legged, corpulent, with eye-brows meeting, and prominent nose." M. Godet calls this a "fancy portrait;" we prefer to consider it a gross caricature, having its origin in the morbid imagination of the Ebomite heretic who wrote the Clementines for the very purpose of slandering the Apostle of the Gentiles. M. Godet is mistaken in supposing that the description is taken from the apocryphal acts of St. Paul and Thecla. With regard to St. Peter's visit to Rome, M. Godet, strangely enough, directs all his controversy against another Protestant writer, Thiersch, of whom he complains somewhat bitterly as being "almost the only theologian of mind who still defends the assertion of St. Peter's sojourn in Rome in the beginning of the reign of Claudius." Of St. Peter's martyrdom in Rome during Nero's persecution, he says, quoting Hilgenfeld:—"To be a good Protestant, one need not combat this tradition." On textual questions we rejoice to find that M. Godet is a strong defender of the integrity of the Epistle. He has no sympathy with critics who would rob us of the last two chapters, for no better reason than the authority of the unscrupulous Marcion. We are glad to be able to quote the learned Professor's opinion on the glorious Confession of Christ's Divinity (Rom. ix. 5), which the marginal timidity of the New Testament revisers has done so much to obscure:—"I have carefully weighed the reasons of those

who deny the fact, yet I have always come back to the first conviction which the Greek construction produces—viz., that Paul really meant to designate the Christ as Θεός."

Most commentators, and especially Protestant, are afflicted with chronic spiritual aridity; but, in M. Godet's case, dryness is sometimes relieved by passages of rare beauty, such as the following. Commenting on Rom. viii. 18–22, he explains *κτίσις* to mean Nature or Creation apart from man, and dwells upon the close solidarity which exists between man and the whole of Nature:—

As the breaking off the bud renders sterile the branch which bore it, so the fall of man involved that of the world. As Schelling said in one of his admirable lectures on the philosophy of revelation, Nature, with its melancholy charm, resembles a bride who, in the very moment when she was attired for marriage, saw the bridegroom to whom she was to be united die on the very day fixed for the marriage. She still stands with her fresh crown and in her bridal dress, but her eyes are full of tears. The soul of the poet-philosopher here meets that of the Apostle. The ancient thinkers spoke much of a soul of the world. The idea was not a vain dream. The soul of the world is man. The whole Bible, and this important passage in particular, rests on this profound idea (vol. ii. p. 95).

1. *Biblia Sacra. Vulgatae Editionis Sixti V. Pont. Max. jussu recognita et Clementis VIII. auctoritate edita.* 1881.
2. *Missale Romanum, &c.* Cum approbatione S. Rituum Congregationis. Folio. 1880.
3. *Breviarium Romanum.* Four vols. 18mo. Second Edition. 1882.
4. *Breviarium Romanum.* One vol. 8vo. 1879. All published at the Liturgical Printing Works of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Desclée, Lefebvre et Cie., Tournay.

THE publications of the "Imprimerie Liturgique" of Tournay, a few of which head this notice, are splendid additions to that mediæval movement which is still working vigorously in many departments of Christian art. The missals and breviaries of the Tournay Society are becoming highly esteemed for their carefully accurate editing, not less than for the luxurious elegance of type, paper, illustration, and binding; indeed, many who sympathize little with the quaint mediæval character of the ornamentation are attracted by the clear beautifully cut Elzevirian types, the easy legibility of which is noteworthy in the smallest editions, while the toned paper adds still further to the ease and comfort of reading them. But for those who do feel attracted by the beauty of mediæval art, these editions are truly *de luxe*; while it is useful to add that the prices of the various publications are remarkably moderate. The aim of the Society has been to reproduce worthily, so far as types and wood-blocks could do it, those works which in olden times were written, one may say, in gold, and at the expense of a life's labour; and, further, to reproduce them with an accuracy of text which was then scarcely attainable. The illustrations are, therefore, not merely

pious pictures bound up in the volumes, but, like the miniatures of illuminated MSS., they are part of the text and have reference to it. It is enough to add, that the Baron Béthune d'Idewalle, the great promoter of the renaissance of Christian art in Belgium, has the guidance of this artistic portion of the undertaking. The volumes which we have selected deserve a few words of special mention.

1. In the preparation of this beautiful edition of the Bible the editor tells us in his preface he has carefully followed the provisions of Clement VIII. The revision of the text was committed to the hands of some Benedictine fathers of the Abbey of Maredsous. The various editions of the Vulgate have been consulted, and the Vatican edition of 1598 has been followed as far as possible, while the labours of the learned Padre Vercellone have been largely availed of. For a better text of St. Jerome's Preface, the edition of Valarsi has been adopted; the foot-notes of which and the index rerum have been carefully corrected of numerous mistakes, and a useful index of lessons, epistles, and gospels of the Sundays has been added. The volume is printed in double columns, with red borders and marginal references, while the volume is adorned with a frontispiece, two large pictures, and twenty-two smaller ones as "têtes de page."

2. The folio Missal recommends itself at first glance to every priest by the easy legibility of its large modern type. Here, again, a correct text has been zealously aimed at, and prepared by the Benedictine scholars already mentioned. They have consulted the best editions—The Propaganda of 1875, Salviucci (Rome), Marietti (Turin), Pustet (Ratisbon), not omitting, lastly, the older but valuable edition of Plantin-Moretus (Antwerp). The Scripture portions have been carefully edited after the model of the Vatican edition of 1598, the general rubrics reproduced in their entirety, and the proof-sheets carefully read, both by the Benedictine editors and by several other *savants*. The text thus prepared has received the approbation of the Roman Congregation. The art-characteristics of the volume are of the same kind as already described. The smallest accessories that would help to render it of greater practical value have been adopted; thus the usual Roman numerals in the pagination of the "Commune Sanctorum" and Supplement have given place to Arabic figures in red. In those cases where a saint has, besides a proper prayer, other parts of the Mass special, to save references and page turning, the mass is printed *in extenso*. Last, but decidedly not least, the canon is printed in fine large modern type, and is so arranged that the turning of the pages is done at places most convenient and least distracting. A small edition (18mo) of the Missal has been also published of the same character, corresponding with the four-volume Breviary, and admirably adapted for church use by those who like a missal at Mass.

3. On the text of the Breviary the same careful and minute study has been expended. In this instance the editors have not only studied the Breviary of Urban VIII. of 1632, but have had the

favour shown them of being allowed to study the particular copy that contains foot-notes in Pope Urban's own handwriting.

4. The "totum" Breviary—known in mediaeval England as a "porto"—is a wonderfully readable specimen. Thus, for example, it has a separate "Commune Apostolorum tempore Paschali," besides the Common of Martyrs for the same time; also a separate complete Common of Holy Women with all the psalms, and a complete office of the dead; and yet the type can be read as easily as that of the four-volume edition.

In conclusion, we can only make passing reference to an edition of the "Horae Diurnae," of equal excellence of type and illustration, prepared with the same intelligent and loving care by the learned editors: a very useful "Officium Hebdomadæ Sanctæ," extracted from the four-volume Breviary, and a scarcely less acceptable "Officia Propria Passionis," in which will be found the offices of the Passion, now said everywhere, with the Psalms in full, thus saving the frequent and distracting turnings hither and thither into the body of the Breviary. Lastly, the "Little Office of the Blessed Virgin" is also published in Latin; while many other works, liturgical or of a standard character such as the "Imitatio Christi," are among the publications of the Society of St. John the Evangelist. The same Society has published an English "Proprium" for each of their Breviaries and Missals. Specimens of their work may be got at the chief Catholic booksellers throughout the world.

---

*Reading-Book.* Sixth Standard. (The Granville Series.)  
London : Burns & Oates.

THERE is really nothing to be said of this book beyond what we have already said of its predecessors. It takes its place with them for excellence of type, illustrations, and—what is more important—for excellence of editing. It has also this high recommendation of a school-book, that it is cheap—any child in the Sixth Standard would be glad to have these 360 pages of well-chosen pieces for eighteenpence. The pieces are longer than was possible in the smaller "Readers" of the earlier Standards, and are therefore more interesting; the notes are opportune, and, as far as we have observed, sufficiently full and well done. Lastly, the collection embraces, together with some old favourites that deserve never to grow stale, a judicious selection of good modern pieces, by Tennyson, Browning, Dickens, and others. Boys will need no spur to go through "Stanley's Search for Livingstone;" nor will they relish much less "Rip Van Winkle," which is told at length. Both pieces are illustrated. This is an excellent reader for any advanced child.

---

1. *A Manual of Scripture History*: being an Analysis of the Historical Books of the Old Testament. Part III. From the End of the Judges to the Babylonian Captivity. By the Rev. W. J. B. RICHARDS, D.D. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.
2. *Sacred History Reading-Book*. By J. G. WENHAM, Canon of Southwark. Printed for the Author, and to be had of the principal Catholic Booksellers. 1883.

THESE two little volumes are new evidences of the effort that is being made to extend the study of Scripture history among Catholic children. Canon Wenham's "Reader" is for Catholic children, Dr. Richards' "Manual," is rather for their teachers, or at least, for advanced pupils. This Third Part of his Manual is of the same character and excellence as Parts I. and II., which have been already noticed by us, and strongly recommended for schools and teachers. Such a Manual is esteemed of great value by Protestants—witness, for example, the enormous circulation of Pinnock's "Analysis," a work of very similar structure to Dr. Richards'—how much more valuable is it not in the case of Catholic boys and girls, whom we should not like to see reading indiscriminately all the books of the Bible itself! But, besides this, the "Manual" has a further and very important purpose to serve in supplying subsidiary information, in arranging events in their sequence, in bringing together from different books the chief events, *e.g.*, in the life of Saul (as at page 209), of David (page 241), and otherwise presenting to the young teacher or student a systematized and intelligent view of the Scripture narrative. The notes are not numerous nor long, but always useful, and often give in a few words the result of long and varied reading. This Part contains useful Appendixes: on the Physical Geography of Palestine, on the Hebrew Calendar, a list of the kings of Israel and Juda, on the Kingdom of Assyria (condensed from G. Smith's "History of Assyria"), and on Jewish Weights and Measures. The "Manual" we cordially recommend to schools and colleges in the preparation of the subject of Scripture history.

Canon Wenham's Reading-Book gives—as he designs it should—"a fairly easy and consecutive narrative of Sacred History, in the language, as far as may be, of the Scripture itself." The work, let us add, has been excellently done, enough of the sacred text is embodied to make the reading-lesson vivid and interesting; and Catholic schools can now supply themselves with a class reading-book of sacred history of as great literary merit as the best of the now numerous "Readers" in the "subjects" of history, geography, science and art. The book is divided into chapters that deal with one topic, and these into sections, the subject of each of which is excellently stated at its beginning in darker type. The present volume—a small one of 250 pages—carries the sacred story unbrokenly on to the end of Solomon's reign. Another, which we hope will soon appear, will bring it to the end of the Old Testament.

*Programmes of Sermons and Instructions.* Comprising (according to the Course laid down by the Council of Trent) The Apostles' Creed, The Commandments, &c. Second Edition, Enlarged. Dublin : Brown & Nolan. 1883.

THIS volume of "Programmes of Sermons" is prefaced by some twenty-eight letters of approbation from the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland—many of which speak of the work in warm terms of appreciation and praise. This is a brilliant consensus of testimony: which, however, the volume well deserves. It may be of use to mention further what is the character of the service here offered the preacher; "Sermon Books" are of so many different kinds. This volume, then, is not a repertory of text and "matter" like Lohner; nor is it a volume of sermons written out as models; nor, again, is it a mere series of outlines. It is something more than this last, containing "programmes" of more or less fulness, often suggesting thoughts, referring to texts, always directing where amplified matter may be found in standard authors, and frequently itself amplifying a point or points pretty completely. Thus, the programmes, as the author mentions in his Prefatory Address, are designed to help especially to a methodical distribution of subjects in parochial discourses, as also to a good arrangement of matter and effective line of treatment, but are not designed to free the preacher from the "labour" of preparation; by which labour alone preaching becomes "a personal function"—at least meritoriously so. The same Prefatory Address contains some very excellent advice to the young preacher, which together with the programmes themselves we cordially recommend to his notice.

---

1. *The Senior Poetical Reader.* For School and Home Use. With Notes, &c., by P. R. JACKSON. Tenth Edition ("The Granville Series"). London : Burns & Oates, 1882.
2. *The Shakespeare Reader.* King Richard II. ("The Granville Series"). London : Burns & Oates.
3. *Poetical Recitations.* ("The Granville Series.") No. 1 for Standards I. and II., No. 2 for Standard III., No. 3 for Standard IV., No. 4 for Standard V., No. 5 for Standards VI. and VII. London : Burns & Oates.

MANAGERS and teachers will be grateful to Messrs. Burns & Oates for so energetically and ably catering to their requirements in the way of books. Six "Readers" for as many "Standards" and a similar series of "History Readers" have been already noticed, and have received the praise we believe they deserved. We have now two poetical "Readers," one made up of pieces from the best English and American writers; the other containing Shakespeare's Richard II. Both of them appear to us to deserve commendation

as well for their adaptation to a special need in Government schools as for their own merits.

The excellence and value of the "Senior Poetical Reader" have been already recognized and established; it has already gone to a tenth edition, and has been adopted by the London and other School Boards for reading in the Upper Standards, and for the specific subject of literature. For these purposes, and not less for home school-room use, this Reader is excellently adapted. We have looked carefully through it, and find that, happily, the pieces have been well chosen; they are bright, graphic pieces, for the most part, such as children will be attracted to and appreciate. The compiler deserves a word of praise for this as also for the notes. These notes are placed in the margin opposite the words they explain, and are thus before the eye, together with the text. Perhaps there are too many of them. What child ever needs "Sun was low," to be explained by *at sunset*. But the fault is on the good side. Lastly, the paper, printing, and get up of both the little volumes under notice are strikingly excellent. To these advantages "The Shakespeare Reader" adds some capital illustrations. The play is carefully annotated; and this in the case of introducing Shakespeare to a child, has involved a large amount of work that appears to have been carefully done. Indeed in this respect the work is so well done that the play will also serve for the intelligent reading of older children out of school.

The third entry on our list is a series of paper-covered volumes, of twenty to fifty pages each, published at a penny and twopence each, according to their thickness. Their contents are a selection from the "Poetical Reader," arranged in degrees of difficulty to suit the Standards. They will be a great boon for class use; a child may use, tear and wear them out without heavy pecuniary distress; whilst the useful marginal notes of the "Reader" remain.

---

*Select Specimens of the English Poets.* With Biographical Notices, &c. Edited by AUBREY DE VERE, Esq. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

THIS, which we take to be a new edition of a volume published some years ago, is a selection of pieces dating from Chaucer to Tennyson. The good taste and poetic appreciation which has guided the selection makes the volume one of the best of the kind we have seen. Within its three hundred pages will be found characteristic bits from all the leading poets. Mr. de Vere's biographical notices are simply of very high value, containing, as they often do, his critical estimate of the poet's writings. His sympathetic criticism of Wordsworth (p. 190) may be referred to as an instance which justifies our appreciation of these biographical notices.

*A Memoir of the Life and Death of the Rev. Father Augustus Henry Law, S.J.* Part III. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

THIS little volume completes the touching record of the life of Father Law, doubly touching as the solace of his aged father's bereavement. No truer picture of the man could be given than that conveyed in his own letters, so earnest in their unaffected simplicity, so unchanged in their warmth of family affection, amid the duties and studies of his religious vocation. The letters in the present series comprise the whole of his ecclesiastical career, from his noviciate as a Jesuit to his heroic death at Umzila's kraal in South-west Africa, on November 25th, 1880, with all his intervening life in various spheres of activity. Having joined the Order in January, 1854, a few weeks after leaving the navy, he was ordained a priest on September 24th, 1865, and sent out a year later to British Guiana, where he spent more than four years in incessant activity. His zeal and energy were shown in the way he devoted himself to the study of languages, and on this mission he mastered two, Portuguese and Chinese, attaining sufficient fluency in the former to enable him to preach in it, and learning enough of the latter to instruct and evangelize the Chinese immigrants. Returned to England in the end of 1871, he left it again in 1875 for St. Aidan's College, Grahamstown, whence he started full of hope and courage for the new mission of the Zambesi, April 16th, 1879. How he found his death in the savage and inhospitable country of Umzila, amid indescribable hardships and privations, is simply told in this brief record of religious heroism. A true soldier of St. Ignatius, his name adds one more to the long roll of victims of charity and self-devotion furnished by his Order.

---

*Caxton's Game and Playe of the Chesse*, 1474. A verbatim reprint of the first edition. With an Introduction by W. E. A. AXON. London: Elliot Stock. 1883.

THE Middle Ages of Christendom present us with two distinct classes of prose fiction; the almost interminable and, to us moderns, tiresome and monotonous romances of chivalry which proved incapable of surviving the blow dealt them by Cervantes; and, in striking contrast with these, the earlier collections of briefly-told tales or pithy sayings which, though for the most part given as historical, have often but a slender basis in fact, and indeed in many instances originated in the remotest periods of Aryan literature. Into such repertories contributions from the most varied sources, parables from the sacred books of India, anecdotes of Greek sages, episodes from Roman historians, or contemporaneous fabrications found their way through channels as diverse as the collection itself was heterogeneous. The "Gesta Romanorum," composed

about 1340, is the type *par excellence* of this kind of compilations, which were, indeed, largely drawn from some of the later Roman collectors of anecdotes—the Joe Millers of their day. Many of the passages, parables and anecdotes employed, had probably been already collected for homiletic use to serve as telling illustrations or impressive examples, and with some embellishment and amplification subsequently furnished material for compilations which were designed merely for private entertainment, combined, however, with edification. The storied window, or the miniated folio of the Middle Ages, may, by their crudity, offend our perceptions, improved as these are by the progress of the arts; a progress in which such productions, it must be remembered, constituted but an earlier development addressed to contemporaries for whom it was impossible to feel the deficiencies to which only accumulated experience and gradual advancement of knowledge and culture render us so much alive. And so in literature. What was in harmony with a simpler state of manners, to us amid the complex relations and surroundings of modern society, reads as bald and puerile. What cannot, however, fail to strike the attentive observer is the intention that breathes throughout such works. Even in recreation there was to be a spiritual purpose. No joke was too capital to be impressed into the service of morality, nor, it must be added, did any moral application seem too far-fetched to be appended to what appears in our judgment the most inappropriate and unpromising subjects.

At a time when literature was chiefly in the hands of Churchmen, there is no reason for surprise if we discern in it this general direction. Indeed, it is this feature—this tendency to invest all the actions of life with a religious value and intention (which is, of course, to be distinguished from a religious meaning), and consequently also to measure them by a religious standard, that manifests itself so strongly in the earlier mediæval literature, and contrasts so forcibly with the modern spirit ever striving to isolate religion, whether in the household, the school, or the legislature, as a thing distinct from the duties and ties of citizenship and society. That the moral exposition, or application, or the exhortation to the fulfilment of practical duties contained in such miscellaneous repertories of stories was no mere adjunct adopted to excuse or justify their compilation, but was their chief feature, and even their *raison d'être*, is clearly shown by the fact that in some MSS., the story, anecdote, or extract is not given, but merely referred to or indicated in a few words as being well known, while the space is devoted to the "moralization." The circumstance that a story was often altered, sometimes invented, to embody a particular moralization, is another evidence of this.

Such a moralized collection of anecdotes is the *Liber de moribus hominum et officiis nobilium super ludo scacorum*, written about the beginning of the fourteenth century, of which we have here Caxton's translation, probably from the French version of *De Vignay* the

translator of the "Legenda Aurea." From a bibliographical point of view the work is remarkable as being one of the earliest books printed in the English language. It was long held to have been printed in England. There seems, however, every reason to believe it was printed at Bruges. Eleven copies of the book only are known, and of these several are imperfect.

The work has no connection with the game of chess, further than the author's adoption of the different pieces as convenient heads under which to deal out moralities interspersed with a rambling tissue of anecdotic gossip. As there are no minor divisions or sub-headings, the index, which, as far as we have tested it is complete and accurate, is a useful addition.

The editor prefixes an introduction of sixty-three pages, in which he gives some account of the work in its bibliographical and literary aspects. The bibliographical part of the task seems well performed. For the rest, if instead of a discursive notice of several portions of the work, selected from it without any apparent reason for the choice, there had been given in foot-notes, or in any other form, a brief statement of the sources of each story and its previous phases—its genealogy, in fact—as far as known, the result would have been more satisfactory. The demands upon the scholarship and industry of the author would doubtless have been greater. Recent research, however, especially in Germany, has done much to lighten such a task. The labour required for its efficient performance would still have been considerable, but its fruit would have been a work of permanent value as a contribution to a branch of knowledge which is yearly augmenting the number of its students.

The glossary which the editor has appended to the work is a snare and a delusion. When it includes such entries as "mordent, biting;" "fumée, smoke;" "feet,feat;" "historiograph, historian;" "mu-syque, music," it is impossible to excuse the omission of such words as *distourblith*, *middis*, *belue*, *rouar*, *lawhe*, *ooste*, *lesing*, *fornier*, meaning respectively disturbeth, middle, whale, robber, laugh, host, lie, baker, and very many more. Under *ferrement*, the reader is referred to cerements, instead of finding the proper explanation: iron utensils. Notwithstanding Caxton's tendency to Gallicize, not a few expressions are found which seem to indicate Flemish influence. For instance, *how well*, for albeit cf. Flemish *hoewel*. The use of tree (p. 37), like the Scandinavian *træ*, with the meaning of wood as a material, is remarkable. Other expressions, too, are interesting as showing that many thoroughly English words which have long since disappeared must have been in general use in Caxton's time. *Befyghte*, *behate*, *cornerly*, *endlonge* and *overthwart*, *drawhtes*, *ware*, *langed*, *dronkelewe*, are examples of this. The spelling *arsmetryk*, seems to show the accent to have been on the first syllable of the word.

Were the whole volume judged by the glossary, no confidence could be felt in the fidelity of the reprint. We are bound, however, to say that, after most careful and persistent testing and collation with the original work in the British Museum, we have not found the

slightest deviation from the black-letter text of Caxton. We have no hesitation accordingly in recommending the volume as a faithful reprint of an extremely rare work of our first printer, and an interesting specimen of mediæval popular literature.

---

*Jean XXII., sa Vie et ses Œuvres*, d'après des documents inédits, par l'Abbé V. VERLAQUE, Docteur en Théologie, Correspondant du Ministère de l'Instruction Publique pour les travaux historiques. 8vo, pp. 226. Paris : E. Plon et Cie., 1883.

PROBABLY no part of ecclesiastical history is more in need of revision than the lives of the Popes during the "captivity" of Avignon. Contemporary documents are so few and scanty for the earlier periods of the history of the Church, that there is little opportunity of correcting various accounts, and filling up their gaps by the application of modern methods of research ; here, on the contrary, archives, letters, and other sources of information abound, and have been almost unexplored. It is the more desirable that this should be done, because the accounts generally received of the Avignon Popes are derived from Villani, Petrarch, and other Italian authors, whose ardent patriotism led them to depreciate as much as possible those Sovereign Pontiffs who fixed their residence out of Rome. We therefore very gladly welcome this biography of John XXII., the most prominent, and in some respects the most calumniated, of them all.

M. Verlaque has evidently studied with care the documentary evidence available in the libraries of Paris, Florence, Avignon, Cahors, the Vatican, and the British Museum, and has succeeded in correcting a considerable number of misstatements current concerning this Pope. Thus, he shows that Jacques Duèze (apparently the correct orthography of his name) was not the son of a tailor, but of a noble, though bourgeois, family of Cahors ; that he owed his advancement in the Church to no favouritism or intrigues, but to his profound knowledge of canon law, and particularly to the able report on the suppression of the Templars, which he drew up by command of Clement V. for the Council of Vienne. Villani's tale, that he placed the tiara on his own head, while the cardinals were hesitating whom to elect, and exclaimed "Ego sum Papa," is shown to be inconsistent with the contemporary accounts that his election was unanimous. A large part of his pontificate, as well as that of his successor, was troubled by his struggle with Louis of Bavaria. M. Verlaque points out that, in summoning that prince, and Frederick of Austria, to submit to his award of the imperial crown, the Pope was but following the recognized law of Europe, according to which both the rivals had appealed to him as their judge. Though desirous of peace, John XXII. was unable to recede

from the position in which he was placed, and the consequences were disastrous. The continually disturbed state of Italy, which culminated in the taking of Rome and the election of an antipope, prevented all thought of the Pope's return to Italy. The protection of the Emperor also enabled the "Fratricelli" to defy the Papal excommunication pronounced against Michael of Cesena, the Franciscan General, and his companions. The authorities cited by our author show that John XXII. only took this last step after his authority had been repeatedly defied, often in language which foreshadowed that of Luther. The final decision which he delivered on this subject is also carefully examined, with the result of making it quite clear that it was not barred by the merely disciplinary bull of Nicholas III.: its doctrinal conclusions need no defence. No one would now doubt that John XXII. was right in teaching that the consumption of goods, if lawful, implies their lawful ownership; or that we must infer from Holy Scripture that our Lord and the Apostles possessed money and other property.

M. Verlaque is perhaps less clear in his account of the theological question which troubled the last years of his pontificate. We do not quite gather from his account that the Pope actually used the language which he in one place appears to ascribe to him. It seems to have been recognized by every one, except his enemies the Emperor and the Fraticelli, that the Pope did not even express his own private opinion as to the state of the blessed before the last day. As he says himself, in a letter to the King of France, he did not put forward anything of his own, but merely recited the texts of Scripture and of the Fathers which bear on the subject, and encouraged discussion, "in order to advance the knowledge of the truth." The Dominicans, and the theologians of the University of Paris, specially consulted by Philip of Valois, expressed strongly their opinion that the blessed are at once admitted to the beatific vision. No formal decision was, however, given; but the Pope, on his deathbed, caused to be read before the assembled Cardinals a bull declaring the Catholic faith on this subject; which was afterwards published and confirmed by Benedict XII. Such is the account of the most important event of the pontificate of John XXII., which our author has derived from extant contemporary documents. We have not space to dwell on the other cares of his reign—such as the amendment of the canon law and the establishment of the Rota, the division of several important dioceses, and the preparations, which cost him many efforts, for a crusade which gained an important victory at sea over the infidel.

For these, and many other interesting points, we must refer the reader to the book itself, which is so good that we cannot help wishing it were more satisfactory in one or two lesser points. The more important documents are, indeed, given, either in the original Latin or in a translation which we suppose to be literal, but we miss the carefulness and liberality of quotation to which a Brewer or a Freeman have accustomed us. Then we carry away no such distinct idea

of the characters and personality of the various actors as a real historian would have given us; a great loss when we are dealing with such remarkable men as the Pope himself, the Emperor, the General of the Franciscans, and Ockam. In one or two instances, also, M. Verlaque makes statements for which he adduces no evidence. Thus he tells us, that the principal reason why John XXII. so frequently transferred bishops from See to See (which was ascribed by his Italian detractors to a desire to raise the largest sum possible for annates) was, in order to check the simony and intrigues then unhappily too common; but no document is referred to in support of what would be an important fact. We may mention that our author incidentally states that he follows Chaillot and other recent writers in considering that the "Unam Sanctam" of Boniface VIII. was never published by that Pontiff, but was merely a rough draft of a bull, probably derived from a work by *Ægidius Romanus*, an Archbishop of Bourges.

---

*Cromwell in Ireland. A History of Cromwell's Irish Campaign.*  
By REV. DENIS MURPHY, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.  
1883.

WE shall content ourselves with few words of notice of this volume, because we have nothing but approbation and recommendation for it. Father Murphy's volume supplies a want and supplies it well. The matter is interesting to a degree; much of it will be new to very many readers; and his clear style of direct narration is quite refreshing after so much of the stilted and supposed philosophical grandeur of some similar works on this side of the Channel.

Cromwell went to Ireland in the August of 1649, and remained in it only nine months, yet contrived in that short space to leave a reputation for evil behind him which scarcely any other man has rivalled by a lifetime of black deeds. Nearly every part of Ireland is still redolent of his bad name, and traditions point out the evil he did in places where he never set foot. But what he really did was bad enough: and it is well that exaggerated reprobation of one class of writers should be corrected by such a careful investigation of facts as is this of Father Murphy. In our histories or sketches of the Protector there is generally a meagre statement that the condition of Ireland was then, as usual, "critical," and "demanded," as one account says, "the most vigorous measures," that Cromwell went over, and was neither over-cruel nor fanatical, but only "vigorous;" that he took Drogheda, and there by a little severity, which he believed to be only "a righteous judgment on these barbarous wretches" he so intimidated "the rebels" that the remainder of his work was easily done, and he was soon free to seek new laurels in Scotland. The author of the present volume walks mid-

way between such euphemistic and garbled partisanship, and the exaggerated reprobation of popular tradition. He follows Cromwell's career in Ireland in chronological order, the thread of his political narrative being occasionally interspersed with very interesting details of the sufferings of priests. The estimate of Cromwell to which these pages will help may be learned from a few words of the Preface :—

That he (Cromwell) was a brave man, that he was far-seeing, that he knew how to choose his instruments and to use them, that he did his work in Ireland—from his standpoint—well, thoroughly, no one will deny. But that he was a “heaven-sent messenger,” that his conduct, even as a public man, was not contrary to the first principles of morality; that another Cromwell would be the best panacea for Irish discontent, no one ever so little acquainted with the history of his doings will assert, unless his mind is wholly warped by prejudice of race, or by religious rancour. Whoever examines even his brief career in Ireland with impartiality must admit the truth of Clarendon's saying, that he was a great, bad man.

We shall conclude by remarking that the volume is well printed, and illustrated with well-executed plans of Drogheda, Wexford, Kilkenny, &c., and has a full Index, and by recommending the volume to all who care for an interesting and temperate study of this portion of Cromwell's unique career.

---

*Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy.* In Three Volumes.

Vol. II.: Containing Sketches of the Order of England, at the Crimea, in Scotland, Australia and New Zealand. By a MEMBER OF THE ORDER OF MERCY. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. 1883.

WE noticed the first volume of these amusing and interesting “leaves” in January of last year. We are glad to see the second volume, which is equally bright and pleasant, and deals with some very interesting periods in the story of the Order of Mercy. The writer is not attempting a complete and formal history, and hence the dignity of the historic muse is about as much considered in these free and light “leaves” as was Mrs. Grundy herself by not a few of the original-minded ladies and personages who figure in them. Nevertheless, the leaves, at a future time, giving as they do the chief events, and trifling but often significant events connected with the foundations and struggles of the Order throughout the world, will prove of real service to the Catholic historian.

The earlier chapters of the present volume tell how the first Convent of Mercy was founded at Bermondsey; and in later chapters we have the growth and spread of the order throughout England. In the chapter on the Foundation at Hull, the authoress relates the “great convent case.” It was wise to do this; and many will doubt-

less, on opening the volume, turn to it with some interest. The case is too well remembered, however, to require that the names should be suppressed into *S— versus S—*. One other incident we may refer to here, as making this an exceptionally entertaining as well as valuable volume—the hospital services of the Sisters during the Crimean war. The deathbed scene of their great friend, Cardinal Wiseman, is pathetically told.

The portion of the book devoted to their experiences in Australia and in New Zealand are intensely interesting reading, and are made amusing by the writer's never failing treasure-store of anecdote.

In Auckland, the Maoris called the Sisters the "Sacred Girls." The Sisters found them "quiet, intelligent, reflective, and very observant:—

From first to last (Mother M. Cecilia) was devoted to the Maoris, and her love for these poor people was most cordially reciprocated. Once, when two rival tribes were on the point of beginning a terrible battle, she sent them by a faithful native a flag, with a dove bearing an olive-branch embroidered on it, and a message: "The sacred girls beg the hostile parties to be good friends." The natives yielded to her entreaty, and peace was proclaimed.

Such scintillations of wit heralded their first appearance in Scotland as surprises us; weak though they may be justly considered.

When the Sisters went out, they had much low bigotry to encounter. The small boys used to shout in their ears such choice couplets as:—

"A rope, a rope,  
To hang the Pope."

These witty chaps would address them as *Mothers of Mercy*. Sometimes their humour took higher flights. They held dialogues illustrative, no doubt, of their moral habits. Thus, they would assume the *rôles* of confessor and penitent:—

"Father, I stole."

"What did you steal, my son?"

"I stole apples, father."

"Well, give me some, my child."

"No, I won't."

"Then you have no contrition, and you're a bad boy, and I'll give you seven years' in purgatory," said the disappointed young father-confessor, with an air of virtuous indignation.

The candid authoress of these pages sketches the character of one of her religious sisters in lines that will, perhaps, astonish non-Catholic readers, who will not be prepared for this picture of the survival and toleration of so much human nature in the Order made famous to them by the Hull case. Mother M. Gonzaga was what the authoress rightly calls an "original" character; but a "rough-diamond," being in fact a woman of sterling piety, and a good and happy Sister of Mercy. Her external peculiarities are accounted for by the fact that she was brought up in a dockyard, where her uncle was an admiral; she is an illustration of the effects of "environ-

ment" after both conversion and vocation. Let it be added that her superior, the only other person besides the Cardinal who understood her and her fast friend, is pictured here as the very antipodes of Mother Gonzaga.

There is no denying the girl was terrible. It was even reported to the Cardinal that, like her uncle and other sons of Neptune, she could easily be provoked to use the strongest condemnatory expressions, and other naughty words. Once, when some "things" got in her way, she consigned them, in the fewest possible words, to perdition. This was told to the Cardinal, who regarded it rather as a vulgarity than a sin. "Things cannot be damned," corrected his Eminence, when he heard that his *protégée* had cursed. . . .

Once, when a certain baronet gave her a sum of money for her hospital, he said: "It is easy enough to help you with money, but I wish I could help you with my hands, for you sadly need assistance." "All right," she answered, as though she were speaking to one of her sailor friends of early days, "there is the scrubbing-brush, just try it on the stairs." Thus she sometimes vexed people by too literal an interpretation of their offers of assistance. One may guess how it was with a lady of this style when she no longer had the Cardinal to befriend her. He knew her too well to be angry with her on any account.

Every detail, every incident—if possible, every word—is preserved in these chatty, rapid sketches. Some may think them too full and outspoken; we like them, and gladly recommend them. We have not quoted the more serious, historic, and valuable portions; to do so with any desirable fulness would have carried us to greater length than we have space for.

---

1. *The Mystery of Miracles.* By J. W. REYNOLDS, M.A. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883. Third Edition.
2. *The Supernatural in Nature.* By J. W. REYNOLDS, M.A. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883. Third Edition.
3. *Science et Vérité.* By Dr. J. B. L. DECÈS. Paris : E. Plon et Cie. 1883.

MR. REYNOLDS, in the two works first named, has girded himself for a noble work. He comes forward to defend some of the deepest and holiest mysteries of faith from the attacks of unbelievers. The volumes, at first sight, seem full of promise. The literary appetite is whetted at the anticipation of a whole work devoted to a careful and exhaustive discussion of the mystery of miracles, and of the weakness of modern scientific theories. But we feel bound to say that never was performance more disappointing. To join battle with modern sceptics, an author needs more than an ordinary share of philosophic and scientific culture. These conditions seem utterly wanting in the two works before us. Mr. Reynolds has a certain acquaintance with the popular science of the day, and a considerable facility with the *loci* of pulpit rhetoric. But his

style is weak, his thoughts exceedingly commonplace, notwithstanding everything to the contrary paraded on the books' fly-leaves, that bristle with laudatory notices of the press.

Let us take his treatment of the very central question of his book — “Are miracles impossible?” The author replies:—

The miracles of Holy Writ are not connected with silly idle prattle, but associated with imperishable words and facts; are not united to low, ignorant superstition, but to the highest morality. . . . . Indeed, if the evidence of miracles is refused, all testimony must be repudiated; the wisest men charged with folly, if believers are to be accounted silly; all religion is to be declared false if Christianity be accounted untrue; all our faith, all our future, all knowledge of God, of judgment to come, of responsibility to Deity, must be scattered to the winds if miracles be accounted unworthy of credit.—*Mystery of Miracles*, p. 56.

Such are the thoughts which have been treated so often, and in a far abler manner, by men who would not deem their words worthy of print; such are the thoughts that are put forward as a serious reply to hard-headed men. For a sample of the author's science we may turn to p. 98 of the same work:—

Isomerism exhibits marvels of surprising character. Things possessing the same elements, in like number and proportion, may so differ through some hidden process, that their physical, chemical, and physiological properties become and remain permanently dissimilar. If a man retort: “All this no more concerns miracles than water does wine,” we reply: “Even so; but the water was made wine.”

We have given the above passage a fair and unbiased attention; but after all effort we have thoroughly failed to see the point of the last sentence.

We have not exhausted the catalogue of our author's offences; there remains something to be said anent his method of employing quotations. Quotations fulfil a very useful office in the literary workshop. Judiciously handled, they lend great weight to an author's statements and opinions. They may, again, play a useful part in throwing an air of grace and elegance around a phrase which otherwise would turn out very commonplace. But Mr. Reynolds has found another use for the quotation to the trial of his readers. Page after page is filled with scraps of poetry, detached sentences from other writers, barely linked and associated together by a few words from the author, until at length the mind becomes utterly bewildered in the attempt to join together these *disjecta membra* and abandons the attempt in sheer disgust.

It may seem, perhaps, that these remarks are too severe; it may be urged that the good cause of the author should cover a multitude of sins. We cannot admit it. It is surely far better that Christians should behave under attack with dignified silence and reserve, rather than lend themselves to weak outpourings that will only provoke the ridicule and laughter of our opponents. Our verdict on Mr. Reynolds' books must be *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis.*

It is with a sense of relief that we turn to the labours of a Catholic scientist, whose work stands third on our list. It is not, however, on the score of his religion that we give so warm a welcome to Dr. Decès's book, but because it is distinguished by the very qualities that are so conspicuously absent in the defence of Mr. Reynolds. We now come across a man whose science has not been picked up at a course of experimental lectures, but who is evidently an original and earnest investigator. His philosophy, too, is of that solid and trustworthy nature that can only be learned at the feet of those who possess the best traditions of the schools. Mr. Reynolds is content to hurl at the adversary a number of self-asserted affirmations. Dr. Decès advances no statement that he does not support by a host of scientific facts. Indeed, he holds that the great truths of astronomy are the only models for scientific statements, that no truth has any right to be ranked among the laws of Nature unless it is supported by the same overwhelming evidence that obtains in the case of the laws of the heavens. The author then proceeds to establish the laws and causes of life, the laws and cause of instinct, the five kingdoms of Nature, the first cause and truth, revelation and science. Every law is supported by such a mass of real scientific proof, that it is well-nigh impossible to find a weak spot in his armour. Nor are his scientific facts of the common sort that one may gather anywhere. To most readers they will come as a revelation of the more recondite laws of Nature. Selection is quite out of the question, but we may refer at random to his interesting account of the action of fecundated germs, of the instinct of plants, of crystallization, &c. His final chapter on science and natural revelation is distinguished by that broad, elevated thought which is so welcome and so rare. He powerfully traces nine ways in which Providence wonderfully guides and prompts man to his ends; how science has its *credo*, which shows forth in a shadowy way the grand truths of revelation.

The whole work is one which we cannot too heartily commend to the Christian apologist. If he is content to wade through a rather heavy discussion upon truth in the opening chapter, and the somewhat irritating formalities attending upon the dialogue form of the treatise, the reader who takes interest in such matters will here find a rare and exquisite treat.

---

1. *Sister Agatha.* By M. J. H.
2. *From Darkness to Light.* By M. J. H.
3. *Angels' Whispers and Angels' Kisses.* By M. J. H.
4. *Leo: A Tale.* By M. J. H. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1883.

FOUR little books, attractively neat and clearly printed—two tales of conversion, and two possible prizes for young children. In the first, Agatha is one of a family whose religion it would be hard to define, since, though "all were Protestants, no two protested

in the same way." She "burned to go forth and devote her life to those who were poorer and less happy than herself;" so she entered an Anglican establishment, here called, in thin disguise, the Convent at Claverly; and those who are interested in the doings of Anglican nuns will find new descriptive touches and no bitterness in "Sister Agatha's" short story.

The experience of the young, uncared-for governess, who found her way "From Darkness to Light," is told in a more bright and realistic manner. It is slight, but it professes to be true; and in truth there is always value, perhaps the great value of encouragement for similar lives.

"Angels' Whispers and Angels' Kisses" is a book of anecdotes and morsels of pleasant advice for children. A story from the Gospel or the Lives of the Saints is given for every night and morning of a month. Children would enjoy most of these scraps of reading; but in a thoroughly Catholic work the texts heading chapters should be quoted from the Douay Bible.

"Leo" we count the best of the little books for its purpose; which is simply to tell a children's story. There is a sound intention of copying child-life, and writing the every-day experience of a faulty Catholic child. There is need of very bright stories for our Catholic children—still brighter stories, and yet closer copies of their actual life, ought to take the place which is at present held by Protestant or simply non-Catholic fiction in their hands. If M. J. H. will omit such trifles of originality as "tenderer" or "schoolroomwards," and if she will picture child-world with patient copying from Nature, infusing plenty of fun for little readers to smile at, a useful service will be done to our literature for children.

---

*The Wild Birds of Killeevy.* By ROSA MULHOLLAND. London : Burns & Oates. 1883.

THE "Wild Birds" are a boy and girl of an Irish mountain village, who after having often wished to see this beautiful world of ours, are carried out into it by fate, the one with the soul of a poet and the other with the gift of song. How this happens, how nearly their parted lives touch, and whether Kevin ever finds Fanchea, the child of his heart, we leave to our readers to discover for themselves. The characters are alive; but they live in a world idealized by the author's romance of conception and refinement of language; one sees from the Irish western coast white trails of ocean birds that melt in the distance like flights of angels, and even London poverty refuses to show a lower vision than a dainty *briè-a-brac* shop with music and painting in the room above. We could not wish it otherwise; it is our own world after all, seen through the crystal of pure language, artistic sense and joyous perception of natural beauty; and one closes the book with something of the delight that haunted

childhood when Hans Andersen told his tales. We are glad to have a writer gifted with a style so terse and of so rare a charm.

---

1. *The Martyrs of Castelfidardo.* Translated from the French. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1883.
2. *The Monk's Pardon.* From the French of RAOUL DE NAVÉRY. By ANNA T. SADLIER. New York : Benziger Brothers. 1883.

A BOOK crowded with heroism, a magnificent sheaf of life-stories bound into one, and every story true and winning in its spirit of sacrifice and of chivalry—such is Mgr. de Sécur's little book of "The Acts of the French Martyrs of Castelfidardo," now translated by a member of the Presentation Convent, Lixnaw, Co. Kerry. It ought to find its way far and wide among Catholic youth, and the only wonder is that it was not translated long ago. We find here the story of the 14th of September 1860, that glorious defeat, over whose dead Mgr. Dupanloup exclaimed, in his panegyric, "O hills of Castelfidardo that drank their blood and keep their ashes! yesterday your name was unknown—to-day it is immortal." Of each of the valiant dead we might say with the author: "It is certain he had in him the materials for a hero, but God destined him for better things. He wished him to be a martyr." Heroes and martyrs we see them closely here; we are even permitted to walk from couch to couch of the wounded in the Cathedral of Loreto, and trace backward how this heroism began; and to read the deathbed letters, and to witness the parting of mother and son, where both shared one sacrifice with human pain and more than human strength.

"The Monk's Pardon" is a historical romance of the time of Philip the Fourth of Spain, and it would be smoother reading if the archaism of "thee" and "thou" had not been introduced into the translation. The Spanish artist, Alonzo Cano, is the central figure, and incident and sensation abound in the long story that brings him at last to the deathbed of his dying enemy. To our mind the scene of the last confession suffers from a savour of melodrama; tenderness is wanting precisely where it ought to commend to the heart a scene that the mind judges somewhat improbable, though fine enough in conception. But "take him for all in all," Alonzo Cano will be an acceptable hero with those who like a stirring story, where Spanish life gives room for sensational events, and where a Catholic writer has worked with spirit and skill. Our Catholic publishers are making a distinct advance in the tasteful exteriors of their books.

---

1. *A Woman of Culture.* By JOHN TALBOT SMITH. New York : Cath. Publication Soc. Co. 1883.
2. *Without Beauty.* By ZENAIDE FLEURIOT. Translated by ALICE WILMOT CHETWODE. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1883.
3. *Percy Grange.* By REV. THOMAS J. POTTER. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.
4. *Leixlip Castle.* By EMOLIBIE DE CELTIS. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1883.
5. *Our Esther.* By M. F. S. London : R. Washbourne. 1883.

**N**ANO, the "Woman of Culture," is a specimen of the fruits to be expected from what is called in America transcendentalism. Beautiful, intellectual, powerful of mind and strong of will, she has been moulded into a modern pagan by educators in whose philosophy "Christianity meant culture or the worship of the beautiful; the worship of mind as impressed on matter in the production of graceful statuary, solemn temples, fine paintings, musical compositions and startling books. According to their ideas, they retained the cream of Christianity, leaving the skim-milk to the various creeds, and they spoke and they wrote of Catholic doctrines in a peculiar fashion. Beauty was their standard of right and wrong, of truth and falsehood." Nano, despising herself for her wickedness, sinks even to the cruelty of allowing her father to be immured in an asylum in order that she may keep a fortune which he is anxious to restore to its rightful owners or to the poor. The character is too unnaturally hard to excite sympathy; even Olivia, her foil, is not feminine and winning, as we on this side of the Atlantic understand the words. The book is a reprint from "The Catholic World."

Next comes before us an excellent translation—and excellent translation is a very rare thing, for most translators produce French-English, and not the simple spirited language that we speak. "Without Beauty: the Story of a Plain Woman," has a certain simplicity, bluntness, and originality, that suit the subject, and it teaches briefly that beauty of mind and heart can secure to anyone a happy and useful life.

"Percy Grange" is a reprint of a history of boyish friendship which, begun at school, lasts faithfully. Out of three friends, one leads another to the Church, wherein, as a priest, this second saves and consoles the deathbed of the third.

In "Leixlip Castle, a Romance of the Penal Days of 1690," we have a bulky volume of a class which Sir Walter Scott, by his immortal novels, has brought down in perpetuity upon us. There may be in Ireland hundreds who will read the book; but the night scene, the secret Mass and the alarm, in the ruined Priory of Keils, shows that its author, with a little more judgment, could do better things. The whole story should have been up to the level of that passage where the priest, stretched in his vestments hidden, silent, dies a martyr's death for his people; and of that passage

more might have been made. We would remind the writer of a remark in "Loss and Gain," that a bore is not to be described in fiction, for description would amount to reproduction, and the reader would be bored. The same remark holds true with regard to the minute reproduction of groups of characters vulgar in every fibre; so many pages should not have been devoted to the servants' hall of Lady de Rivers, and to the Cromwellian Clotworthy-Grub household (who afflict us also with an original variety of cockney dialect). If Emolibie de Celsis will do more, entirely in his highest tone, like the Priory of Kells scene and other similar passages, he will deserve success.

"Our Esther" is a Catholic story of a servant-girl who bears the blame of her fellow-servants, and who wins others to God by her humble and ordinary life and death.

---

*Links with the Absent: or, Chapters on Correspondence.* By a Member of the Ursuline Community, Thurles. London: R. Washbourne.

A N Ursuline nun of Thurles has brought out, under this title, a guide to letter-writing. Her volume is intended to teach to children, or to the uncertain, or the ignorant, everything concerning correspondence, even to the choice and folding of the paper; and though only a little book of practical directions, it shows unobtrusively its Catholic spirit. Such advice as that given under the heads of "postage," meaning the prepayment of letters and of "postcards," is sensible and useful. Of the examples in the end, the simplest are by far the best, and the most adapted to the manner of our time.

---

*The Youth's Cabinet.* (Monthly.) New York: P. O'Shea and American News Company. 1883.

EVERY good Catholic magazine for the young is a step in the right direction, and this is one—small in size, and very large in print, but also cheap, and illustrated. We wish there was no tinge of bitterness in the poems, &c., about Ireland; without it, love and patriotism can exist quite as warmly, as the maker of this friendly suggestion not only knows but *feels*. Reading is here for the young of every age, and the smallest corner is filled with something of value—for example, out of a corner before us looks Bossuet's "golden saying"—"The sincerity of a Christian ought to be perfect, and so well known that every one can go by his simple word."

---

*Sermons and Discourses.* By the late Most Rev. JOHN MACHALE, D.D., Archbishop of Tuam. Edited by THOMAS MACHALE, D.D., Ph.D. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1883.

MANY a reader will turn with interest to a work which records the words of one who has spoken with a power which few men of his age and country have possessed. A collection of his sermons on the most varied subjects, some forty in number, are here presented to the world.

No one will fail to notice the stateliness of style, the sonorous fall of the sentences that distinguish these sermons and harmonize so well with the character of the great prelate. His words of warning and denunciation are especially weighty; if they can read so in cold print, what must have been their effect when delivered with all the weight of his character and office? A well-timed preface from the editor, excellent type and binding, unite to render the volume attractive.

---

*Sancti Anselmi Mariale. Poème de St. Anselme sur la Sainte Vierge.*  
Par P. RAGEY, Mariste. Paris : F. Levé. 1883.

THE hymn "*Omni die dic Mariæ*," known amongst us as "Daily, daily, sing to Mary," was found in the tomb of St. Casimir, King of Poland, lying upon the breast of the sainted king. After this, by almost universal consent, the poem has been generally described as the Hymn of St. Casimir. Le Peré Ragey comes forward to claim the authorship of this poem for St. Anselm of Canterbury. The little *brochure* before us is a model of patience and research.

After much poring over old parchment, the author at last made a great find: he discovered the hymn in an old York Psalter, very probably of the eleventh century. This, of course, narrows down the question of the authorship considerably, as it excludes St. Bernard and the school of St. Victor from all claim. But it is by no means conclusive for St. Anselm. Great as was the popularity of the saint's prayers and meditations, he has left no name as a hymn-writer. Another discovery, however, has rewarded the author's efforts. He has lighted upon a prayer-book of the twelfth century in which the hymn is found incorporated in a collection of St. Anselm's prayers. Such is the evidence advanced in favour of the saint's authorship. To us it appears fairly strong. We may add a somewhat in the way of confirmation by remarking that the prayers in this collection are admitted by the most scrupulous of editors, Mr. M. Rule, to be undoubtedly from the pen of St. Anselm.

---

*The Story of the Scottish Reformation.* By A. WILMOT, F.R.G.S.  
London : Burns & Oates. 1883.

WITH a vigorous pen Mr. Wilmot traces the story of the Scottish Reformation up to the end of the seventeenth century. This is done so briefly as to be complete in a small volume of less than two hundred pages. There is noticeable in this author's writing a certain crudity of statement and *brusquerie* of manner towards adversaries, which mars the pleasure of reading, and will, we fear, prejudice unfavourably such non-Catholic readers as would otherwise greatly benefit by it. English readers who are not very well posted in this portion of Scottish history, or who, as is most likely the case, have learned it from anti-Catholic sources, will find these pages interesting and useful. Mr. Wilmot is an enthusiastic admirer of the Queen of Scots and venerates her as a martyr—in this sharing the feelings still more recently expressed by Mr. Colin Lindsay in his letters to the *Tablet*.

---

*Necrology of the English Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict, from 1600 to 1883.* By the REV. T. B. SNOW, M.A., Priest of the same Congregation. London : Burns & Oates. 1883.

FATHER SNOW'S volume reaches us at a late moment, but fortunately it is not of that class which calls for studied criticism. We shall take for granted, as we believe we may readily do, that he has attained as near as may be absolute correctness, in the chronological details of the long catalogue of lives, each of which is here recorded with all possible condensation in a few, many of them in two or three lines. Those details will be of great interest to not a few readers ; the author justly remarks in his introduction :—

The Death Roll of the English Benedictines will enkindle an honourable family pride in the breasts of the English sons of St. Benedict, and will awaken an interest in many who are linked by ties of blood, reverence, and gratitude to the members of the Venerable Order.

This is very true: we will only add that the volume will also prove of great service as supplementary to the Church history of England during the period covered by it. The list opens with a martyr—Dom Mark Barkworth, who, born in Lincolnshire, and educated at Rheims and Valladolid, came on the English Mission and was hanged at Tyburn, February 27th, 1601. And the long and persevering record of death after death of English Benedictines through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, down to our own day, points forcibly the truth of what Father Snow says : "St. Benedict has never deserted England."

The most attractive portion of the present volume to the general reader will be the well-written and interesting historical intro-

duction, where will be found a warm and graphic sketch of the English branch or "Congregation" of the Order, from the coming of St. Augustine to the Reformation, with the subsequent resuscitation of the English Benedictines when the "last of his race," the venerable Father Sigebert Buckley, in his 91st year, a prisoner in the Gatehouse at London, on a November morning in 1607 professed the two young priests, Robert Sadler and Edward Maihew. This incident is pathetically told by Father Snow; but we must not quote, more particularly as we adverted at length to the incident in our notice of Dom Weldon's Chronological Notes in our number of January, 1882. There is also in the introduction much useful information on the organization of the English Benedictine Congregation, and on such points as the continuance of certain now titulary priorships and abbacies: many readers will learn for the first time that these titles are perpetuated by Pontifical decree. The volume also contains a necrology of the Benedictine nuns of Cambrai. Lastly, an alphabetical index completes its value as a book of reference.

---

*The Return of the King.* Discourses on the Latter Days. By HENRY JAMES COLERIDGE, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

ANY work from Father Coleridge will find ready welcome and many readers: the present volume of sermons has an additional attraction in the mysteriousness of the subjects with which it deals. The end of this world, its judgment, the final home of men, and the kingdom of the Son of God—these are subjects which have a strong attraction, even fascination, for many. And they will be interested to see how a reverential mind deeply imbued with Scripture knowledge here treats them.

It is needless to say that the spirit and aim of the sermons is a moral one; and not that of speculating over commentators and theories, and tickling the fancy and amusing with graphic pictures of fanciful interpretations of those obscure texts which prophesy the great end. We may be permitted to quote one illustrative passage, although it be found in a sermon that has already been published:—

I gather two conclusions from what we have been considering, and with them I will end to-day, though the truths on which they are based will be constantly before us in the course of these sermons. The first of these is that we can seldom find an age in the life of the Church in which she has not to contend with the evils which will rise to their highest expression in the last days. The last times have really been upon us from the beginning of the history of the Church, as S. John says in his Epistle. The principles which, in their full and final development will produce the state of things on which the last judgment will fall, have been always at work in the world and always countermiming the holy

and saving influences of the Church of God. . . . Each generation of Christians thus has its part to play in this holy warfare; for it has to fight in in its own day against the principles which will assail the Church with the greatest fury in the days of the end. . . .

There is another reason also which may account for this urgent vigilance and ever wistful expectation in which the lives of the saints have always been passed. . . . We can see almost at once why it was that, at so early a period, and again later on, the disciples of the apostles, and indeed, the generality of Christians, were literally, as our Lord bade them be, like men waiting for Him. With them, the last time was not so much the end of the world, the close of the long conflict of the Church, the great day of account, as *the coming of the Lord*. . . . Now, as to this, we are all on a level. . . . Our part is played, the latter days are come to us, the judge is at the door, we meet Him at our death. This is the one true view of our condition here.

This is the key-note to the discussion and application of the mysterious themes which are here successively handled: Antichrist, "The Decay of Faith," and of Charity "The National Spirit," "The Abomination of Desolation," "The Man of Sin," "The Judgment," "The Book of Life," "All Things made New," "Death." These solemn topics occupy twenty-one sermons, all of which we have read with interest. Some of them are especially noteworthy, it appears to us, for the sufficient, suggestive and practical way in which the difficult subjects are treated:—"The Creed of False Science;" "The Loosing of Satan," in which, in passing, there is a very sensible and thoughtful appreciation of "spiritualism;" "The Particular and General Judgment," a remarkably well-worked-out and forcible sermon; and lastly, the four concluding discourses on "The Greatness," "The Sacredness" and "The Happiness of Death," and on "Our Lord and Death." The sermons come very opportunely for Advent—the season to which their subjects belong: preachers will find them suggestive and useful reading, as will all who care to be filled with the spirit of that holy season in which "the Church blends the two Advents."

---

*The History of the Catholic Archbishops of Tuam.* From the Foundation of the See to the Death of the Most Rev. John MacHale, D.D. A.D. 1881. By OLIVER J. BURKE, A.B. T.C.D. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co. 1882.

M R. BURKE has compiled a succinct account of the Archbishops of Tuam, from the foundation of the See to the present time, which, though completely interesting, but barely fulfils the promise of its title, or of its somewhat sounding preface. "In my researches," says the author, "I had unrolled the roll of centuries, and accumulated facts concerning the Archbishops of Tuam, from sources unknown to many and examined by few; and it seemed to me that the memory of those Archbishops and of their deeds should not be allowed to

perish wholly from the minds of men. Thus was I tempted to write their history!" After this it is surprising to find the "unrollings" of more than eight hundred years compressed into little more than two hundred pages. Much more than one third of the volume is devoted to a notice of Archbishop MacHale. Not enough to exhaust so wide a theme; and yet premature we should say, seeing that the late Archbishop's papers are "not yet fully arranged." A complete life of the "Lion of the fold of Judah" would be most acceptable, and should be as attractive, if not more so, than that of "J. K. L." It is probably no fault of the author that so little is told of the See of Tuam from A.D. 540 to A.D. 1150. In the 9th century, "Danish hordes swept over the land, who massacred monks, and destroyed schools." And in A.D. 1130, certain "lawless Irish chieftains plundered and destroyed many ecclesiastical edifices and rivalled the Danes in savagery." In those lawless times no doubt many valuable records were irretrievably lost. From A.D. 1152 to A.D. 1881 Mr. Burke gives a complete list of the Archbishops of Tuam, and has something of interest to say of each of them. The sketches of William de Birmingham, A.D. 1289, Florence Conry, A.D. 1609, and John de Burgo, A.D. 1647, being perhaps the most able.

In glancing over the calendar we cannot help noting how largely Tuam was indebted to the religious orders. Thirty out of forty-five Archbishops were religious—viz., Cistercians, three; Augustinians, three; Dominicans, five; Knights Hospitallers, two; and Franciscans, seventeen.

In the sad sufferings of penal days Tuam had perhaps more than its share, of which many details are given.

Though we think a complete biography of the great Archbishop MacHale should be yet to come, it is only fair to say that the present sketch is very full, and though necessarily covering such well-worn ground as "Irish Poor Law," "Proselytism," and "National Education," is always interesting. Many of the Archbishop's letters on these and other topics are given, with letters to him from O'Connell, Tom Moore, and others. There are scattered through the book many items of antiquarian interest, amongst others the story of the Golden Cross of Cong; in use within memory, yet unaccountably sold to the late Professor M'Cullagh, and by him presented to the Royal Irish Academy. We believe all Mr. Burke's readers, and we trust they will be many, will join him in the hope "that it will yet be borne aloft in holy procession in the Cathedral Church of Tuam." We may add that the volume is beautifully printed and embellished with an excellent portrait of the present Archbishop, Dr. MacEvilly. It is unnecessary to say anything of the few pages devoted to this prelate. We trust that his life-history will not need to be written for years to come.

---

*The Life of the Venerable Father Claude de la Colombière, S.J.*  
Abridged from the French Life by EUGENE SEGUIN, S.J.  
(Quarterly Series.) London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

THIS short life of a great preacher and the apostle of devotion to the Sacred Heart will be surely very acceptable in its English dress. His life was a comparatively short one, for he died at forty-one; but was full of good work and merit. Twenty-two years had been devoted to the faithful and earnest observance of his rule; his youth was one of innocence, yet he was a wonderful example of mortification; he had desired to be a martyr, and instead he lived to make the Confessors' crown more glorious. Father Coleridge says in his preface:—

English Catholics have a special interest, both in the devotion to the Sacred Heart and in the career of Father de la Colombière. He was the first to introduce that devotion into England, and his spiritual child, Queen Mary Beatrice, was among the first to petition the Holy See for the institution of the Feast of the Sacred Heart.

Father de la Colombière came to England in 1676; he succeeded Father St. Germain when the latter had to quit the country because of the ill-feeling aroused by the baseless fabrications of the intriguer Luzancy. Father de la Colombière became preacher to the Duchess of York, and her confessor. He worked hard in England during two years, and both made conversions and roused many of the timid and neglectful to a sense of their duty to God. After Titus Oates' plots, he was accused either by the same Luzancy who had maligned his predecessor, or by another Frenchman, and was arrested and put into prison. Designs were imputed to him against the King and Parliament which would not have borne investigation in any but those days of bitter feeling and blind hatred, when nothing was too unlikely or atrocious to be easily believed of Catholics; and the Father was both a foreigner and a Jesuit. He was kept in prison some weeks, and only escaped death through the determined intervention of the French king through his ambassador. He was exiled, and died six years later at Paray-le-Monial.

The Life here noticed bears little mark of being a translation. It is clear, easy reading; the narrative is not lost in reflections, but at the same time the spiritual and ascetic side of the venerable father's life is well and sufficiently dwelt upon. It is this aspect and also his relation with Blessed Margaret Mary, that will make it a pleasing and useful addition to our stock of English Catholic biographies.

*The Leofric Missal*, as used in the Cathedral of Exeter during the Episcopate of its first Bishop, A.D., 1050-1072. Together with some account of the "Red Book of Derby," the Missal of Robert of Jumièges, and a few other early MSS. Service Books of the English Church. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by F. E. WARREN, B.D., F.S.A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1883.

THIS well-printed and elegant quarto deserves a word of welcome from us; and we may repeat as our own, the Editor's thanks, expressed in his Preface, to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, "for undertaking a publication which would have been too costly for individual enterprise." We must also express our thanks to Mr. Warren himself for having carefully, and at cost of so much labour, edited this reproduction of a valuable old Catholic Missal. He has added an Introduction, for the greater part of which we desire also to express our indebtedness. We cannot, indeed, express gratitude for that minor portion of it, which is based on Mr. Warren's well-known anti-Roman ideas, concerning which we have more than once expressed ourselves; but neither is it incumbent on us here to repeat our dissent, nor need the Catholic reader feel any annoyance. Mr. Warren is neither vehement nor offensive, and it is natural he should step forward to show how a very early Missal (which is entirely, of course, concerned with the Mass), testifies to some ritual differences between English and Roman practice. Of course, we feel very sure that he quite mistakes the significance of such differences; but there is no need to show how in this place.\* We owe to Mr. Warren a careful and scholarly edition of the Leofric Missal, and we are grateful for it.

What is its importance? the reader may ask. Any relic of the Anglo-Saxon Church is interesting—this one we call important, because it is one of the three only known surviving Missals of that period. It is thus of great liturgical value. It was bequeathed to Exeter Cathedral by its first Bishop, Leofric. It is certain that Leofric was Bishop of Exeter; it is not so certain where he came from, whether he was a Cornishman, or a Breton, or what. Mr. Warren attaches importance to the fact that he was educated in Lotharingia. And although he was not a Norman, yet his education had given him foreign tastes, and his—even his—appointment was one of those which "tended to the de-insularization of the English Church, and to its assimilation to the Continental Church in the loss of national privileges, and in an increased subservience to the Papacy." We are glad after this to learn that Mr. Warren is "glad to believe the *post-mortem* panegyric, preserved in this Missal, which states that Leofric was most active in teaching, preaching, promoting Church restoration, and in fulfilling all the other duties of the episcopate." If he was all this in spite of his

\* It happens to have been already done in an earlier part of our present number. See Rev. S. Malone's article, "Church Discipline and Protestant Historians."

deficiencies, what a paragon of bishops would he not have become had he only been insular and tenacious of his own way and quite apostolic in his defiance of the Papacy! But it seems that he was tenacious of his own way after all, only that way was also the way of Rome. We come back, therefore—or we should come back if it were worth while—to the old question as to Rome.

This Leofric—honourable man or otherwise—was Bishop of Crediton from 1046 to 1050, when, having obtained the direction of the King and the sanction of Pope Leo IX., he transferred his See to Exeter. The reason which he assigned for this transfer, in writing, to both King and Pope, is characteristic of the time: “The need of greater safety from the attacks of pirates.” Leofric was Bishop of Exeter from that date till his death, 1072. His gifts to Exeter were many and valuable—the editor gives a long list of them. “The list,” he adds, “closes with a request that worshippers at Exeter Cathedral would pray for the soul of Leofric, and the imprecation of a malediction on any persons who should be concerned in the alienation or removal of his gifts.” This notwithstanding, they have been alienated and removed, many of them lost.

The Missal with which we are here concerned made its way to Oxford in 1602 as part of the Bodleian library. We share the editor's regret that a companion Missal of Leofric's, also given by him to Exeter, was not presented to the Bodleian at the same time, as it is now, perhaps irrecoverably, lost. The present condition of the one here edited is thus stated:—

In its present condition it is a stout quarto volume, consisting of 378 leaves of vellum, 8 in. by 6 in., exclusive of six blank modern paper fly leaves, which belong to the same date as the brown Russian leather binding, which it received from some Oxford bookbinder about a century ago. . . . The volume, in its present form, is of a very complex character, and consists of three main and distinct divisions, which for convenience sake may be designated as Leofric A, B, C.

Leofric A, which forms the bulk of the volume, is a Gregorian Sacramentary, written in Lotharingia early in the tenth century.

Leofric B is an Anglo-Saxon Kalendar with Paschal tables, &c., written in England, *circ. A.D. 970*.

Leofric C consists of a heterogeneous collection of Masses, manumissions historical statements, &c., written in England, partly in the tenth, partly in the eleventh centuries.

A frontispiece facsimile of one page of the earlier portion of this venerable relic shows the decayed state into which it has fallen, and suggests very vividly the patience that must have been needed for its successful reproduction as we here have it. The Missal is remarkable for the large quantity of proper prefaces it contains. “Every greater festival and almost every minor holy day” had its proper preface. “There are several hundred prefaces,” we read, “in the present volume; a number which has been reduced to ten in the present Roman and to five in the Anglican rite.” Though we cannot feel any horror for this wholesale “reduction” of prefaces, we can very heartily re-echo Mr. Warren's estimate of those that we

meet here for the first time. They are "sometimes of great beauty, sometimes adorned with well-expressed antithesis, or with quaint conceits of thought, sometimes couched in language which perpetuates the memory of the life or character of a saint." The Canon of the Mass is almost word for word that of the present Roman Missal; the Ordo Baptismi is, for the most part, the same; whilst the Oratio, Secretio and Ad Complendum (*i.e.* Post-communio) of a vast number of the Masses are more or less nearly identical in the two Missals.

We do not think it worth while to dispute as to whether in Bishop Leofric's day the laity received under one or both kinds. But we cannot help remarking that Mr. Warren's arguments—taken from the body of the Missal—for reception under both kinds strike us as weak. Of the six Collects quoted, three or four are found in same words in our Roman Missal. And we quite dissent from his interpretation of the rubric (at p. 241 of the Missal), for administration to the sick. The consecrated bread was dipped in wine—(the rubric of the Leofric Missal says, "ponat sacrificium in vino *sine aquâ*")—there were indeed some who wrongly thought that the wine by contact became consecrated, while many held that it was specially sanctified—it had not yet been defined: but the origin of the practice was doubtless to render the particle easier to be swallowed, and the fact of using wine shows that the sacrament was not given under that species.

Mr. Warren, also, is not so careful as we should expect him to be in arguing:—

The Mass for the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary on p. 268, implies a date later than the institution of that festival in 1067.

This is supplemented in a note by:—

This Festival did not become general and obligatory till much later.—Smith, W., "Dict. of Christian Antiq." ii. 1144.

Now Leofric C, about which he is here arguing, may be no older than he contends; but such argument as this lends no light to the discussion. Who says that the Festival was instituted in 1067? True it is that in Smith's Dictionary we have the story of Abbot Helsinus, who in that year was told in vision to keep it. But if the writer in Smith be worth quoting, he should be quoted as calling this story legend—a legend sometimes fathered on S. Anselm, and as going on to say, "passing from legend to history," it was established in England in the twelfth century. And we may add, that Benedict XIV. (De Festis J.C. &c., ii. § 205 *seq.*) traces it from England to Normandy, then to France—and to Rome not till S. Bonaventure's time, if so early! But it was far more ancient in Spain, where it was kept in the seventh century, and in the Greek Church, where it is recorded in the sixth—in the Greek Church on the 9th of December. In the "Typicon" of S. Sabas (+531) it is called ἡ σύλληψις τῆς ἀγίας Ἀννας, μητρὸς τῆς θεοτόκου—the name quoted in Smith's Dictionary, if we remember rightly, as the equivalent of the Latin, Conception of Blessed Virgin Mary.

In spite of the animus which is apparent in the effort to claim for the Anglo-Saxon Church a measure of independence of Rome—which, if it be expressed as differences from Rome in certain rites and practices, disciplinary matters, differences which Rome knew of, tolerated, often approved, we readily agree to—yet Mr. Warren admits as much as even Rome herself would dream of contending for, with regard to that distant period. He says:—

While admitting the assiduity and generosity of the first bishop of Exeter, we must also note his tendency and determination, in common with other foreigners intruded about the same time into English Sees, to Romanize the Church of England. Roman in origin, owing her existence to the forethought of one of the greatest of Popes, and fostered at first by Roman missionaries and bishops, the Church of England had been consistently and loyally Roman in doctrine and practice. Her first liturgical books, as well as vestments and church ornaments, came direct from Rome, being sent by Gregory to Augustine. Her archbishops from the very first applied for and wore the pall. But along with a just and ready recognition of her debt to Rome she had retained, till the reign of Edward the Confessor, certain privileges and notes of autonomy, which are necessary to the independent life of a national church (p. 24).

It is not for us to try to discover what these privileges and notes were. Mr. Warren ought to tell us. He mentions two. First, the mode of electing bishops, which, up to Edward the Confessor, “resembled that prevailing in the Anglican” rather than the present Roman Church! The second note of autonomy which Mr. Warren brings forward is, that the early English Church canonized her own saints. We may safely leave the Anglo-Saxon Church Roman on Mr. Warren’s own showing, if these be the only exceptional privileges.

But let our last words be with the venerable old English Missal, with its Mass, and prayers for the dead, and loving honour of the Blessed Virgin and the saints of every land in the one great “Communion.” This is Mr. Warren’s gift to us: he has edited it carefully and well, and we thank him warmly for it.

---

1. *The History of Mary Stewart, from the Murder of Riccio until her flight into England.* By CLAUDE NAU, her Secretary. Now first published from the original MSS., &c. Edited, with Historical Preface, by Rev. JOSEPH STEVENSON, S.J. Edinburgh: William Patterson. 1883.
2. *Mary, Queen of Scots, and her Marriage with Bothwell.* By the Hon. COLIN LINDSAY. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

**T**HIS large and important volume has, unfortunately, not reached us until almost the last moment before going to press, but it will be well to give it a welcome, and tell our readers something of the nature of its contents.

Among the manuscripts preserved in the Cottonian Library, which forms a part of the treasures of the British Museum, is one which is described in the Official Catalogue as “An Historical Treatise concerning the affairs of Scotland, chiefly in vindication of Mary, Queen of Scots (French, a fragment).”

This French fragment Father Stevenson translated some time ago, and published an abstract of it in the pages of the *Month*: many of our readers will doubtless have already read it there. In this volume the complete translation is given, together with the French original. To these Father Stevenson has prefixed a long and valuable historical preface, and inserted here and there appendices of other important documents, altogether forming a goodly octavo volume of some five hundred pages. The manuscript in the Cottonian Library just referred to is so badly written, and so further confused by insertions, erasures, alterations, and what not, that the editor concludes it has lain there so long unnoticed simply from its illegibility. With a skill and patience that excites admiration he has unravelled it—He claims that it is written by Queen Mary's secretary, Claude Nau, and suggests that it was probably drawn up under her own supervision. This claim of authorship is important; but we should not hesitate to take the authority of an expert like the editor as conclusive of the internal evidence; he places two facsimiles before his readers—one, of a page from this narrative, and another of a draft of a letter, the authorship of which is determined by the signature of Nau himself. There is an abundance of his writing in the British Museum and General Record Office. As to internal indications, it is certainly written by an ardent admirer and partisan of the Queen—there are touches in it by which we fancy the impulsive French secretary can be recognized.

Nau became the Queen's secretary in 1575, and he served her until nearly the time of her death. The editor believes that it was when Mary and her household suffered from the harshness and close confinement under Sir Amias Paulet that they beguiled the weary evenings in telling stories, and that the Queen was induced to amuse them with the story of her own early life, and then of men and doings more recent: "Moray and Lethington, Lindsay and Morton, Riccio, Darnay and Bothwell."

Is it too violent a supposition to imagine that her secretary, moved by the narration of incidents at once so touching and so terrible—incidents, too, in which she who was speaking had faced the chiefest danger and endured the longest suffering—that he should endeavour to give a permanent existence to the outline of the history which she even then was telling them, and while she was yet speaking that he should attempt to reduce her words to writing? That, at his earliest leisure, he should bestow upon his unfinished draft the revision, the correction, the expansion which he was conscious it needed? That where he doubted he would ask for information from the authority most capable of giving it?

When Mary was decoyed from Chartley, Nau and Curle separated from her, and herself imprisoned with new indignities at Tixal, all her papers left behind at Chartley were seized. Four Justices of the Peace spent two long days in searching all her drawers, desks, closets, and three boxes of documents were sent to Windsor for Elizabeth's inspection. When Elizabeth had gratified her curiosity, the law officers selected such documents as would be useful in the projected

trial of Mary. "Through what hands these papers passed, to what treatment they were subjected before they were produced in court, it would now be impossible to affirm." It is important to bear this in mind: they were doubtless interpolated, falsified, to the extent of present need, if there were any need, as we feel sure there was. The history of the MS. can thus be traced from Chartley to the possession of Sir Robert Cotton, who procured it and others with it from Phillipps, one of Walsingham's agents. The fatality that fastened on every thing connected with Queen Mary did not pass by Nau. The Queen died doubting his fidelity to her; and there is grave cause to suspect that through bribery or fear he did betray her secrets to her enemies, though he afterwards zealously denied it and defended his honesty.

The narrative of the Queen's secretary is imperfect and mutilated: it begins abruptly at the point where the murderers of Rizzio discuss with Darnley what is to be done with the Queen, and how she is to be got out of their way; we have the touching interviews between the offended woman and miserable husband, and the details quickly follow of the escape from Holyrood. "A few only of the facts recorded in this have hitherto been known to us, and that in their barest outline. We are indebted to Nau's manuscript for the curious details now for the first time published." The narrative comes to a conclusion shortly after the Queen's escape into England, thus covering some of the most interesting and debated incidents of the unhappy Queen's career—the murder of Darnley, the Queen's detention by Bothwell at Dunbar Castle, and her marriage to him.

As to Bothwell, we may refer to the famous visit of the Queen to him late in 1566, when she rode from Jedburgh to Hermitage Castle, where he lay dangerously wounded. She did not undertake the journey in simple obedience to her wishes, she was "requested and advised" to do so. It was an official visit; Bothwell was a trusty servant, and had nearly lost his life in her cause and service. She was accompanied by Moray and several courtiers; the visit was not longer than the two hours mentioned in Lord Scrope's letter to Cecil; in fine, there was nothing of that suspicious character assigned to it by some of the Queen's calumniators. The sudden illness with which she was attacked immediately after her return from Hermitage Nau deliberately ascribes to poison. It is not the only poisoning case mentioned in his narrative which had nearly proved fatal to the imprisoned Queen.

Mary's last appearance in Nau's pages is one in which she shows herself to advantage. Queen Elizabeth had given the Earl of Shrewsbury, who was Mary's custodian, to understand that several of the powers in the Continent of Europe, regarding her as the centre of Catholicity, and as such the source of every political disturbance, would gladly have purchased their own tranquillity by her execution, but that she, Elizabeth, had magnanimously scorned to listen to any such proposal. Mary, therefore, he argued, was indebted for her life to the grace of his sovereign. This statement was too important to be disregarded; Mary requested to see the papers referred to, but the Earl refused to produce them, and

laid himself open to the rebuke which she administered to him. She assured him that so far from being ashamed of the estimate in which she was held as one of the defenders of Catholicity, she gloried in the name. That being a sovereign, the term "grace" was misapplied when applied to her. She would receive "grace" from no person living, and she begged that a similar remark might never be addressed for the future.

Her independence, the editor remarks, was a strong feeling in Mary Stuart's breast, which she kept alive to the last. Only deeper still, he claims, lay her religious convictions, her strong attachment to the Catholic faith, in which she had been well trained. This faith she was determined not to abandon, come what would. He concludes:—

So then our parting interview with Queen Mary Stuart brings her before us in a character which excites our sympathy and commands our respect. She vindicates two great principles, her love of her country and her love of her religion. Elizabeth Tudor took care that the world should know that Mary Stuart was thoroughly in earnest in the expression of those sentiments. Twenty years of cruel captivity and a bloody death did for the Scottish Queen what she could not have done for herself; and they are another proof, if any such were wanting, that every truly noble character is made perfect through suffering.

We wish we could find nothing in the volume before us at variance with this estimate of Mary's nobility of character. But the editor speaks of her marriage with Bothwell, in language which is simply irreconcilable with moral nobility.

This has led us to join with Father Stevenson's large and handsome volume a small and unpretending but valuable tract. The Hon. Colin Lindsay reproduces in it the letters which he has written to the *Tablet*, in which he deals with the obscure and difficult question of Mary's marriage with Bothwell. Father Stevenson says:—

Mary seems to have thought that the necessities of her condition compelled her to accept the terms offered by her council, while she knew that any so-called marriage with Bothwell would be illegal, invalid and immoral.

We should require more proof than this narrative to believe that Mary knew she was doing an immoral act in marrying Bothwell. The narrative, however, as well as we can read it, testifies to nothing of the kind, nor even to the editor's further suggestion that Bothwell, during the week at Dunbar, had made her the victim of his brutal violence. Mr. Lindsay joins issue with Father Stevenson on score of the above quoted passage, and his letters go into the matter fully.

Mary knew of the relationship of Bothwell and Jean Gordon, and could easily be persuaded that it had never been dispensed by the Church: and, in point of fact, Mr. Lindsay's aim is to show that the papal dispensation in the matter of their consanguinity never took effect. But the Lords were determined she should marry Bothwell, and Bothwell was equally determined, and to his force they lent representations about the plausibility of which there can be little doubt. Claude's narrative helps to heighten one's deep and

unmitigated horror for the lying, treacherous, unscrupulous villains who surrounded the unfortunate victim.

With reference to the supplementary matter contained in Father Stevenson's volume, we need only mention that we have in it a foretaste of the treasures now being opened to scholars with the opening of the Vatican archives. He has recently been lecturing on the amazing difficulty he experienced in getting access to those archives in the days of Pius IX. Some of the results of his success are here, as also documents from the private archives of the Society of Jesus. The appendices contain, first, a report on the state of Scotland under Queen Mary, written in 1594 by Jesuit Fathers in Scotland and sent to Pope Clement VIII.; the documents following contain reports from the archives of the Jesuits on the state of Scotland, and the Queen's affairs, partly taken from a report of William Lesley, brother of the Laird of Lochleven; and other accounts drawn from her own letters, &c. Appendix V. is important, and contains an account of the mission of William Chisholm, Bishop of Dumblane, to the Pope.

---

#### BOOKS OF DEVOTION AND SPIRITUAL READING.

1. *Life of St. Margaret of Cortona.* By Fr. G. REVEGNATI. Translated by F. McDONOGH MAHONY. London: Burns & Oates 1883.
2. *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.* By F. A. BELLECIO, S.J. Translated from the Italian of F. A. BRESCIANI, S.J., by W. HUTCH, D.D. Second Edition. London: Burns & Oates 1883.
3. *An Easy Method of Meditation.* By Rev. F. X. SCHOUIN, S.J., Translated from the French by L. M. K. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1883.
4. *Growth in the Knowledge of our Lord.* Meditations for every Day of the Year. Adapted from the French original of the Abbé DE BRANDT, by a Daughter of the Cross. Vol. IV. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.
5. *Pious Affections towards God and his Saints.* (Quarterly Series.) Meditations for every Day in the Year and for the principal Festivals. From the Latin of Ven. N. LANCISIUS, S.J. With Preface by F. GEORGE PORTER, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.
6. *Maxims and Duties of Parents.* By M. ARVISENET, Vicar-General of Troyes. Translated from the French by Sister M. B. DAVIN, of St. Michael's Presentation Convent, Portarlington. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1883.
7. *Lives of the Saints, from Alban Butler.* Selected and edited by Rt. Rev. Monsignor GODDARD. London: R. Washbourne. 1883.
8. *Evenings with the Saints.* By W. H. ANDERDON, S.J. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

9. *The Loves which reign in the Heart of Mary.* (Our Lady's Library.) For the Month of May. London: Richardson & Son.
10. *New Manual of the Third Order of St. Francis.* According to the recent decisions of the Holy See. Dulwich: St. Anthony's. 1883.

THIS life of St. Margaret (1) is written after what is generally termed the "Italian" method, the nine chapters of the book are taken up with a description of the saint's characteristic virtues. The incidents of her life are very lightly touched upon; in fact, the early part is so curiously treated, that many a reader, coming unprepared upon the work, would find a difficulty in understanding why the saint should be held up as a model of heroic penance. The familiar colloquies of our Blessed Lord with this favoured soul occupy the larger part of the book, forming a collection of spiritual reading that requires attentive and careful perusal.

2. As a handbook to the "Spiritual Exercises" of St. Ignatius, we know nothing that will prove more serviceable than this little work of F. Bellecio. All that is needful for a retreat of eight days, meditations, considerations and spiritual reading are comprised in this one volume. The meditations, perhaps, are a little full and diffuse, but most of us are very willing to condone this fault in retreat time. We need hardly add that F. Bellecio's "Spiritual Exercises" has found much favour abroad, and Dr. Hutch has conferred a real boon on English readers by furnishing them with so excellent a translation.

3. "The Easy Method of Meditation" here described is that which goes by the name of the "Second Method" of St. Ignatius. There are many souls who are unable to occupy their minds with reflections on the great truths. To such persons St. Ignatius offers an alternative method, which is here treated. It is to take each word of the vocal prayers which we have been accustomed to say, and weigh its meaning, extract the hidden worth and beauty that are sure to underlie all the forms of prayer consecrated to the liturgy of the Church. In the work before us F. Schouppe devotes himself to the five prayers that are dear to every Catholic heart—viz., the Our Father, Hail Mary, the Creed, *Animus Christi*, and *Salve Regina*. He gives different patterns of exercises to show what a depth of meaning, what treasures of wisdom, are lurking beneath the words that too often glide so glibly off our lips.

4. We noticed the first three volumes of this excellent work in our number for April, 1883 (p. 510). The present volume, the fourth, takes us down to the twentieth Sunday after Pentecost; Meditations are also added for the chief festivals occurring up to the end of September, and there are exercises for a spiritual retreat.

5. Those who are at all acquainted with the venerable Lancisius will know that his works require no commendation from us. These meditations are short and pithy, but those who have used them know what a depth of thought and meaning are contained in these concise sentences. A very practical preface, by F. George Porter,

opens the volume. We cannot but remark the extreme niceness and precision with which the editor solves all difficulties and doubts concerning the exercise of meditation. There is no reference to any other system or method which might be fairly recommended to some who are struggling with difficulties in prayer. We cannot withhold a word of praise for the excellent style in which each succeeding volume of the Quarterly Series continues to appear.

6. This is a little work which is full of woe and denunciation. We could hardly recommend it as pleasant soothing reading. The author finds much to reprehend in the conduct of parents generally, and he is urgent in bringing before their eyes the punishments to come. We have remarked one or two slips in the translation of the proper names. In English we usually employ the Latin form *Pulcheria*, and not *Pulcherie*. Precise scholars will write *Loeta* in Latin text books, but for the general reader it is puzzling to find the diphthong broken up, the translator will find it more acceptable to print *Loeta*. St. *Syphroneus*, of Auten is surely a mistake for St. *Syphorian*, of Autun.

7 & 8. It is, indeed, a pleasing sign to note a demand for "Lives of the Saints." The Saints themselves have uniformly recommended such holy lives as the best of all spiritual reading. The two works we have named together have evidently been brought out in demand to a growing want. The collection of Monsignor Goddard is simple and unambitious in its scope. He has selected some fifteen lives of the more notable Saints of God from the collection of Alban Butler, and presented to the reader the simple text shorn of note and commentary. He holds, and many will hold with him, that the stately phrase and solid learning of Alban Butler has not been approached by any other English Catholic author. And many a reader to whom the larger work is unaccessible will thank Monsignor Goddard for placing within their reach these pearls from the treasures of our great hagiologist. The collection of F. Anderdon will appeal to another class of readers. He, too, has made a selection of some twenty lives of the Saints; but while Monsignor Goddard has gleaned among the founders of religious orders, F. Anderdon gives us chiefly the passions of the martyrs. The good Father evidently well knows how fascinating to the young are the stirring deeds of the great martyrs of the Church. Young people are never tired of hearing the dialogue in which the heroes of our faith confound the pagan tyrant, and the minute description of their tortures and death exerts a painful attraction over their minds. Many a boy will prefer F. Anderdon's "Evenings" to the most exciting story-book. The author has taken care to tune his style of writing to the character of his selection. He writes in a bold, nervous style, gives licence at times to the imagination to describe scenes and speeches which we do not remember to have met with in Alban Butler. But he has produced a very interesting series, and we should say that the work will be well calculated to interest the young in the lives of the Saints.

9. Another charming little work from the pen of one who has striven so earnestly to propagate devotion to our Blessed Lady. The authoress at times rather reminds us of some of the traits in F. Faber's style. The great charm of her writings to our mind is the glow and fervour that light up the simplest phrase, the unmistakable warmth of desire to win souls to God. Some of this charm is lost in the written word, but it must have invested these conferences when spoken with a powerful influence. Under the title of the work, the authoress has ingeniously developed the love of Mary for the different virtues that should grace the religious and secular life. We venture to express a hope that her health and strength may be spared to pursue her labours in the interests of God and souls.

10. Since the publication of the Constitution of Leo. XIII. remodelling the rule of the Third Order of St. Francis, a manual of this kind has become necessary. This little hand-book will be welcome to members. It is very complete, containing not only the Encyclical and Constitution of the Pope, but the new rule, and the prayers and exercises suitable to the Order.

---

#### LIST OF BOOKS RECEIVED.

“Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty and the Reformation Period.” By S. Hubert Burke. Vol. IV. London: J. Hodges.

“Principles of Religious Life.” By Very Rev. F. C. Doyle O.S.B. London: R. Washbourne.

“The Life of Martin Luther.” By Rev. William Stang. New York: F. Pustet and Co.

“Growth in the Knowledge of our Lord.” From the French of Abbé de Brandt. Vol. V. London: Burns & Oates.

“The Standard of Value.” By W. Leighton Jordan. London: D. Bogue.

“Christian Charity in the Ancient Church.” By G. Uhlhorn. Translated by Sophia Taylor. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

“The Parochial Hymn Book.” London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

“A Course of Philosophy.” By the Very Rev. A. Louage, C.S.C. Second edition. Baltimore: J. B. Piet & Co. 1883.

“A Personal Visit to Distressed Ireland.” By R. F. Clarke, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

“Principles of English Canon Law.” By John Brownhill, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

“Roma e Costantinopoli.” Pel P. Enrico Legnani, D.C.D.G. Modena. 1883.

“An Outline of Irish History.” By Justin H. Mc Carthy. London: Chatto & Windus.

“Groundwork of Economics.” By C. S. Devas. London: Longmans. 1883.

## INDEX.

---

ADDIS, Rev. W. E., Notices by, 441, 445.

Adrian IV. and Ireland, 83; Bull of, recently called in question, *ibid.*; Text of supposed Bull of, 86; Authorities for its grant not reliable, 90; other letters of, relating to Ireland, 92; text of Bull of, not in Vatican Archives, 94; refusal of, to grant Ireland to Henry, 97; letter of, to Louis VII., and supposed one to Henry, compared, 99; the one letter the basis of the forged grant, 102.

African Inland Sea, Science Notice on, 167.

Alexander III., Pope, supposed Bull of, confirmatory of Pope Adrian's grant of Ireland, 94.

American Association of Science, Science Notice on, 428.

Ames, F. S. D., Little Hinges to Great Doors, *noticed*, 213.

Analecta, Bollandiana, Tome I., *noticed*, 196.

Anderdon, Father, Evenings with the Saints, *noticed*, 493.

Angels' Whispers and Angels' Kisses, *noticed*, 475.

Art and Anthropology, Science Notice on, 170.

Arvisenet, M., Maxims and Duties of Parents, Translation, *noticed*, 493.

Ashton, John, Social Life in Reign of Queen Anne, *noticed*, 223.

Assumption of B. Virgin Mary, Ancient English testimony to, 297.

Austen, Jane, 103; her early life, 105; Lees Society in Bath, 107; her fame of slow growth; difficulty of disposing of her early books, 108; tone and sentiment of stories belong to eighteenth century, 111, difference of quality of her second triplet of novels, 112; general characteristics of her books, 113; objection to their commonplace nature, 117; analysis of "Pride and Prejudice," 118; criticism of it, 126; religious aspect of novels of, *ibid.*; novels of, innocuous, but fail to exercise highest influences, 128; Steventon edition of novels of, *noticed*, 456.

BALLARD, R., Solution of the Pyramid Problem, *noticed*, 455.

Barry, William, D.D., on Freiligrath, 63.

Batteries, Secondary, Science Notice on, 168.

Beal, S., The Fo-Sho-Hing-Tsar-King, *noticed*, 228.

Beginnings, 402.

Belgium, Projects of the Liberals in, 306; increased hostility and energy of the two parties in *ibid.* Recent Liberal victory, 307; Liberals alter constituency for fear of future defeat, 309; Harrassing legislative anti-Catholic measures, 311; Higher positions open only to Masons, 312; Project of revising the Civil Code, 313; character of M. Laurent the reviser, 314; Revised section on Marriage, 315; The new parental rights, 318; Family and individual rights all confiscated, 321; M. Laurent's virulent animosity against Orders and Church associations, 322; whether the confiscated Church property is to go, 329; Liberal debts and how they are paid, 334.

Bellesheim, Dr. A., Notices by, 211-439.

Belleciov's Spiritual Exercises, Translation, *noticed*, 493

Blood, eating of, disciplinary, 385.

Bollandiana, Analecta, Tome I., *noticed*, 196.

Bonaventure, S., *De humanæ Cognitionis ratione, &c., noticed*, 439.  
 Brandt, Abbé de, *Growth in Knowledge of Our Lord, noticed*, 493.  
 Bridgett, Rev. T. E., *some new Documents on Our Lady's Immaculate Conception*, 291 *seq.*  
 Brocklehurst, T. M., *Mexico To-day, noticed*, 238, 284, *seq.*  
 Brownson, Orestes A., *The Works of, noticed*, 189.  
 Bühler, Geng, *The Sacred Laws of the Ayras, noticed*, 455.  
 Burke, S. Hubert, *Historical Portraits, Vol. III., noticed*, 232.  
 Burke, O. J., *History of Archbishop of Tuam, noticed*, 483.

CASARTELLI, Rev. L. C., *The Three Fausts*, 245.  
 Catholic Politics, *see* Politics.  
 Caxton's Game of Chesse, *noticed*, 465.  
 Centuriators, wrong historical Canons of, 374; they ignore traditions, 374; appeal to Schismatical Greek Church, 383; distinguish fundamentals from non-fundamentals, 385.  
 Chambers, M. C. E., *Life of Mary Ward, Vol. I., noticed*, 190.  
 Church Discipline and Protestant Historians, 370.  
 Church consecration, rites of, 379.  
 Clerke, A. St. John, *The Settled Land Act, noticed*, 217.  
 Clerke, A. St. John, and T. Brett, *Conveyancing and Law of Property, 1881, and Amendment Act, 1882, noticed*, 217.  
 Clerke, Miss E. M., *Modern Mexico*, 260.  
 Coleridge, Father, *The Return of the King, noticed*, 482.  
 Colombière, Father Claude de la, *Life of, noticed*, 485.  
 Cotterill, J. M., *Peregrinus Proteus, noticed*, 226.  
 Communion under one kind, disciplinary, 381.  
 Craik, Henry, M.A., *Life of Jonathan Swift, noticed*, 206.  
 Creighton, M., *History of Papacy, noticed*, 239.  
 Croke, Archbishop, return of, from Rome; reception in Ireland, 157; words of, regarding Papal Circular, 160.

DAUNT, W. J. O'N., *Note to his Article on "How the Union Robs Ireland," 244; Ireland in the Time of Swift, 337.*  
 Darkness to Light, From, *noticed*, 475.  
 Darmesteter, J., *The Zend-Avesta, noticed*, 228.  
 Davids, T. W. Rhys, and H. Oldenberg, *Vindya Texts, noticed*, 228.  
 Davidson, D. T. S., *The Doctrine of the Last Things, noticed*, 225.  
 Davis, John, *The Bhagavad Gita, noticed*, 220.  
 Deces, Dr., *Science et Vérité, noticed*, 473.  
 Decretæ Authentica S. Cong. Indulgentiæ Sacrisque Reliquiis præpositæ, *noticed*, 218.  
 De Noduwez, J. N., "Exceſſor," *noticed*, 234.  
 Deschamps, N., *Les Sociétés Secrètes et le Société, noticed*, 241.  
 Dharmatrāta's Udānavarga, Translated, *noticed*, 451.  
 Dies Irae, Note to Article on 50 versions of, 243.  
 Discipline and Dogma, distinction between, 370; confounded by Protestant historians, 372; mistake of Flaccus Illyricus in confounding, 373; regarding Lent, 377; regarding nuns and Church, 379; regarding the eating of blood, 385.  
 Dorner's System of Christian Doctrine, Translated, *noticed*, 441.  
 Doucet, Henry, *Essai sur les Rapports de l'Eglise avec l'Etat Romain, &c., noticed*, 193.

Education, Elementary: Our Position, Prospects, and Policy, 389; value to, from present necessity of supporting Catholic Schools, 390; some

grounds for anxiety in New Code from nature of inspectorship, 392; danger to, from School Boards, 394; best present Catholic line of action, 395, action with parents, 396; should moderate eagerness for success in secular knowledge, 397; recognized importance of training and discipline, *ibid.*; duty of Catholics, 400.

Electricity, Recent Progress in, Science-Notice on, 425.

Electric Railways, Science Notice on, 168.

Equality, principles of, in politics, 2, 4.

FAUSTS, The Three, 245; the worth of life the ultimate subject-matter of philosophy and of poetry, 246; Calderon, Marlowe, and Goethe teach by interpreting a hero, Faust, 249; historical foundation for the Faust legend, 250; Marlowe's version, 252; Calderon's version; he introduces Justina, 255; contrast between Christian and non-Christian readings of life, 256; contrast illustrated as to part played by the intellect, 257; and by free-will, 258.

Foley, Henry S. J., Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, Vol. VII., *noticed*, 194.

Francis, S., New Manual of Third Order, *noticed*, 494.

Francis de Sales, St., on 25; historical position of doctrine of, 26; amount of dogmatic theology in writings of, 28; general characteristics of dogmatic teaching of, 29; attitude of, towards Church, 32; hatred of, for heresy, 33; did he hold Papal Infallibility, 39; devotion of, to Blessed Virgin Mary, 41; sentiments of, towards "Sacramentalism," 44; style of writings of, 48; change from an academic to more natural style, 51; his clearness, 54; force, 55; the personality of his style, 57; the Saint and the needs of his age, 60; orders of men and women founded by, *ibid.*

Freiligrath, 63; early education of, 64; first poetic attempt of, 65; colour of his style; word painting, 67; his wide human sympathies, 69; first successes; takes to poetry, 70; his power as a translator, 71, 82; marries, 73; accepts a pension from the king, and refuses it, 74; his work to announce and prepare the German Revolution, 75; his errors, 76; is indicted for sedition; tried, 78; resides in England and becomes more a Socialist, 80; his return to Fatherland, 81; Germany at his death, 82.

GASQUET, F. A., O.S.B., on Adrian IV. and Ireland, 83.

Gaume, Mgr., Catechism of Perseverance, Translation, *noticed*, 238.

German Revolution, Freiligrath, the part of, 75; its failure, *ibid.*

Giraldus Cambrensis and Adrian IV.'s grant of Ireland, 90.

God, existence of, value of certain natural convictions and tendencies as proofs of, 403 *seq.*; the universal source of intellectual light, 411.

Godet's Commentary on St. Paul to Romans, Translated, *noticed*, 458.

Goddard, Mgr., Lives of Saints, *noticed*, 493.

Gough, A. E., Philosophy of the Apanishads, *noticed*, 221.

Granville, Series Reading Book VI., *noticed*, 461; Senior Poetical Reader, Shakespeare Reader, and Poetical Recitations, *noticed*, 463.

Grisar, Dr. Hartmann, S. J. Galileistudien, *noticed*, 211.

Guéranger, Very Rev. Dom Prosper, the Liturgical year, *noticed*, 188.

HAGENBACH, Dr., a History of Christian Doctrine, *noticed*, 441.

Hefele's, Bishop, History of the Councils of the Church, English Translation, Vol. III., *noticed*, 197.

Henry II., circumstances under which he asked Adrian IV. for Bull conferring Ireland, 85.

Herbert, Lady, Life of St. John Baptist de Rossi, *noticed*, 205.

Herbert de Losinga, Bishop of Norwich, sermons of, 292; mistakes of Protestant editors of, 298.

Hermes Trismegistus, Works of, Translated, *noticed*, 457.

Hermann, Life of Rev. Fr., Translated, *noticed*, 232.

Historical Canons, False, laid down by Centuriators, 374.

History, mischief to, from principles of private judgment, 376.

Hobart, Rev. W. K., The Medical Language of S. Mark, *noticed*, 215.

Hudson, T. S. A. Scamper through America, *noticed*, 228.

IRELAND, and Adrian IV., 83, *seq.*; the Holy See and the clergy of, 148, *seq.*; reception of Pope's condemnation of Parnell Tribute in, 154; unsatisfactory character of National leaders in, 163; in the time of Swift, 337; state of Catholics at end of XVII. century in, 339; legislative independence of, 361.

Immaculate Conception, Some new documents on Our Lady's, 291; sermons of Herbert, Bishop of Norwich, and tradition of English Church, concerning, 293; their testimony explicit, 294; testimony of Exeter "Lectionary," to, 302.

JOHN of Salisbury, did he obtain Bull from Adrian IV. for Henry II, 87; his account of transaction suspicious, *ibid.*; last chapter of his "Metalogicus" and interpolation, 89.

John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter, Mr. H. Reynold's editing of [the "Ordinale" of, 292; and of the "Lectionary," 293.

Joly, N., Man before Metals, *noticed*, 236.

KERSHAW, Frances, J. M., The Gamekeeper's Little Son, *noticed*, 214.

LACORDAIRE's Life of S. Dominic, Mrs. E. Hazeland's Translation, *noticed*, 194.

Lancisius, Ven. N., Pious Affections towards God, *noticed*, 493.

Law, Father, Memoirs of Life and Death of, *noticed*, 465.

Leo, a Tale, *noticed*, 475.

Lent, diversities of ancient discipline regarding, 377.

Leo XIII., Letter of, on Historical Studies, 413; Encyclical of, on the Rosary, 420.

Liberty, principle of, in politics, 3.

Limerick, violation of Treaty of, 338.

Lindsay, Hon. Colin, Mary Queen of Scots, *noticed*, 489.

Lingard, Dr., History of England, Copyright Edition, *noticed*, 192.

Loves which Reign in the Heart of Mary, *noticed*, 494.

Lyall, Sir A. C., Asiatic Studies, *noticed*, 447.

MACCARTHY, J., History of the World, *noticed*, 232.

Mackey, Rev. H. B., O.S.B., on S. Francis de Sales, 25; Library of St. Francis de Sales, Vol. I., *noticed*, 186.

MacHale, Archbishop, Sermons and Discourses, *noticed*, 480.

Magnetism and Conscience, Science Notice on, 427.

Maine, Sir H. S., Dissertations on Early Law and Customs, *noticed*, 452.

Malone, Rev. S., Church Discipline and Protestant Historians, 370.

Martyrs of Castelfidardo, *noticed*, 477.

Mercy, Leaves from Annals of Sisters of, *noticed*, 471.

Mexico, Modern, 260; physical features of, *ibid.*; the plains of, 262; the higher regions of, 264; the Pass of Rio Frio and the Valley of Mexico, 265; site and buildings of city of, 268; coloured population of, 269; rural aspect of, the *haciendas*, 271; routine of life in a *hacienda*, 272; condition of farming in, 273; manufacture of aloe beer, 276; of intoxicants, 277;

vanilla and cochineal culture in, 278 ; metallic treasures of, 279 ; constitution and population of, 280 ; Christianity of the Indians of, 283 ; political and religious changes in, 285 ; trade of, 288 ; the Red Man and the future of Mexico, 291.

Mivart, St. George, on Catholic Politics, 1.

Missal, The Leofric, *noticed*, 486.

Mulholland, Rosa, Wild Birds of Killeevy, *noticed*, 476.

Murphy, Rev. D., Cromwell in Ireland, *noticed*, 470.

My Story, *noticed*, 230.

NAU, CLAUDE, History of Mary Stewart, *noticed*, 489.

Navéry, Raoul de, The Monk's Pardon, *noticed*, 477.

Noble, Frances, Through Thorny Paths, *noticed*, 230.

Nun, rites of consecration of, 380.

ORIENTAL rites, value of testimony of, 383.

PALESTINE CANAL, The, Science Notice on, 425.

Palmer, William, M.A., Notes on a Visit to the Russian Church, 129.

Parnell Testimonial Fund, condemned by Rome, 149 ; why it was condemned, 150 ; abuses admittedly attendant on his agitation, 156.

Pelliccia, A. A., The Polity of the Christian Church, Translation, *noticed*, 201.

Periodicals, *noticed*, German, 172, 431 ; Italian, 175, 434 ; French, 179, 429.

Pirenne, Henri, Sedulius de Liège, *noticed*, 199.

Poetry, the ultimate aim of, 246.

Politics, on Catholic, 1 ; examination of Conservative fundamental doctrines in, 2 ; principle of changes in, 5 ; principle of representation in, 8 ; liberal promises belied by deeds, 10 ; must Catholics be Conservatives ? 11 ; Are the Middle Ages a political ideal, 12 ; Catholic errors in politics, 14 ; the *desideratum* is a new political condition informed by the old spirit, 16 ; fundamental differences between political parties, 18 ; friendliness of political parties to religion, 19 ; duty of Catholics as to parties, 23.

Pope, The, effects of his condemnation of Parnell Tribute, 152 ; no idea in Ireland of turning against, 156.

Programmes of Sermons and Instructions, *noticed*, 463.

Propaganda circular to Bishops of Ireland, on, 148 ; text of, 166.

RAGEY, P., Sancti Anselmi Mariale, *noticed*, 480.

Respiration, Artificial, Science Notice on, 171.

Revegnati, Fr. G., Life of St. Margaret of Cortona, Translation, *noticed*, 493.

Reynolds, Mr. Herbert, his edition of "Ordinale" of Exeter, 292 ; and of the Exeter Lectionary, 293.

Reynolds, J. W., Mystery of Miracles, *noticed*, 473 ; the supernatural in Nature, *noticed*, *ib.*

Ricard, Mgr., Les Premiers Jansenists, *noticed*, 440.

Richards, Dr., Manual of Scripture History, *noticed*, 462.

Richardson, S., Killed at Sedan, *noticed*, 230.

Richardson, G., An Account of well-authenticated Miracles, *noticed*, 242.

Russian Church, Anglican interest in, 129 ; growth of Erastianism in, 130 ; little use made of the Sacraments in, 134 ; want of ecclesiastical training in, 135 ; laxity about communion in, 136 ; rigorism about fasting in, 137 ; liberalism in, 140 ; comparison of with Anglican Church, 143.

SCHOUPE, Father, Easy Method of Meditation, *noticed*, 493.

Science Notices : An African inland sea, 167 ; secondary batteries, 168 ; electric

railways, *ib.*; art and anthropology, 170; artificial respiration, 171; recent progress in electricity, 425; the Palestine canal, *ib.*; thought reading, 427; magnetism and conscience, *ib.*; American Association of Science, 428.

Scott, Robert H., Elementary Meteorology, *noticed*, 235.

See, The Holy, and the Clergy of Ireland, 148.

Seton, W., Rachael's fate, *noticed*, 230.

Sister Agatha, *noticed*, 475.

Smith, S. B., Elements of Ecclesiastical Law, *noticed*, 182.

Snow, Father, Necrology of the English Congregation O.S.B., *noticed*, 481.

Spalding, Bishop, Lectures and Discourses, *noticed*, 233.

Stella's first acquaintance with Swift, 343.

Swift, Ireland in the time of, 337; youth, education, and early trials of, 340; makes acquaintance of Stella, 343; goes to Laracor, 345; interests of, in Ireland, 346; published the "Tale of a Tub," 348; the journal of, to Stella; its value, 350; growing political influence of; publishes "The Conduct of the Allies," 354; writes "Drapier's Letters," 358; on absenteeism, 363; publishes "Gulliver's Travels," 364; his death; character, 365; Irish estimate of him, 370.

THOUGHT Reading, Science Notice on, 427.

Tournay, Liturgical publications of Society of St. John the Evangelist of, *noticed*, 459.

Tradition wrongly ignored by Centuriators, 374.

Tradleg, Nitram, A Son of Belial, *noticed*, 229.

Tsar, The, and his Holy Synod in 1840, 129.

UNCLE Ned's Stories, *noticed*, 230.

Ussher's Editio Princeps of Epistle of St. Barnabas, Backhouse's edition, *noticed*, 219.

VAHEY, J. W., A Catholic Priest and Scientists, *noticed*, 215.

Vanessa's acquaintance with Swift, 355.

Vere, Aubry de, Specimens of English Poets, *noticed*, 464.

Verlaque, V., Jean XXII., *noticed*, 468.

Vera Cruz, 262.

WARREN, F. E., mistake of, regarding discipline, 379; edits Leofric Missal, 486.

Wenham, Canon, Sacred History Reading Book, *noticed*, 462.

West, E. W., Pahlavi Texts, *noticed*, 228.

Wickes, W., Dr., Accentuation of Poetical Books of Old Testament, *noticed*, 445.

Winer's Chaldaïsche Grammatik, *noticed*, 445.

Wilmott, A., The Scottish Reformation, *noticed*, 481.

END OF VOL. X.

'1;  
ight  
of

0;  
in  
a;  
et  
n,  
5;

of,

n,

l,

;

7